

Weekly Compilation of  
**Presidential  
Documents**



Monday, January 1, 2001  
Volume 36—Number 52  
Pages 3163–3215

## Contents

### Addresses to the Nation

Christmas greetings—3178, 3179

### Addresses and Remarks

*See also* Bill Signings; Appointments and Nominations  
Budget—3204  
Global Food for Education, initiative—3201  
Radio address—3174

### Appointments and Nominations

U.S. Court of Appeals, judge, remarks on recess appointment—3180

### Bill Signings

Assistance for International Malaria Control Act, statement—3185  
Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2001, statement—3167  
Education Department appropriations legislation, remarks—3163  
Health and Human Services Department appropriations legislation, remarks—3163  
Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001, statement—3184  
Labor Department appropriations legislation, remarks—3163  
National Moment of Remembrance Act, statement—3210  
Omnibus Indian Advancement Act, statement—3185  
Shark Finning Prohibition Act, statement—3179

### Communications to Congress

Japanese whaling practices, letter—3212

### Communications to Federal Agencies

International financial institutions and other international organizations and programs, memorandum on funding—3201  
Puerto Rico, memorandum on resolution of status—3177

### Executive Orders

Adjustments of Certain Rates of Pay—3176  
Establishment of the President's Task Force on Puerto Rico's Status—3176  
Revocation of Executive Order 12834—3210  
To Strengthen the Federal Government-University Research Partnership—3211

### Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters  
Briefing Room—3204  
Oval Office—3180  
Interview with the New York Times—3185

### Statements by the President

*See also* Bill Signings  
Census 2000—3209  
Death of Jason Robards—3184  
North Korea, efforts to improve relations—3209

### Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—3215  
Checklist of White House press releases—3214  
Digest of other White House announcements—3213  
Nominations submitted to the Senate—3214

**Editor's Note:** The Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents is also available on the Internet on the *GPO Access* service at <http://www.gpo.gov/nara/nara003.html>.

## WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

## PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Week Ending Friday, December 29, 2000

**Remarks on Signing the  
Departments of Labor, Health and  
Human Services, and Education, and  
Related Agencies Appropriations  
Act, 2001**

*December 21, 2000*

Sit down. Thank you. You just have to do what I ask for a few more days. *[Laughter]*

First, I'd like to thank the very large delegation from the United States Congress and both parties who are here: Senator Specter, Senator Conrad, Senator Dorgan; from the House, Chairman Goodling, Representative Obey, Representative Kildee, Representative Kelly, Representative Talent, Representative Porter, Lowey, and Clement. Did I get everybody? *[Laughter]*

I'd like to thank the mayor of Philadelphia, John Street, for joining us; and our neighbor, the Prince George's County Executive, Wayne Curry; and the members of the Cabinet who are here: Secretaries Riley, Shalala, Summers, Herman, Slater; EPA Director Browner; SBA Director Alvarez. Did I leave anybody out? Chief of Staff Podesta and my Economic Adviser Gene Sperling. And I'd like to thank Jack Lew and Sylvia Mathews and all the people on the budget team who worked so hard at OMB for this.

This is a good day for our country. For 8 years now, we have worked in this administration to prepare our country for the new century and a whole new era of human affairs by building a nation in which there is opportunity for every responsible citizen, a community of all Americans, and a nation that leads the world toward greater peace and freedom and prosperity. Today we have two more examples of that in implementing our strategy of trying to make the right, real choices for America and not be trapped in the old, false choices.

Earlier today, this morning, we announced new steps to preserve our environment by cleaning our air, steps that will protect the

health of all Americans by dramatically reducing pollution from trucks and buses powered by diesel fuel, building on the announcements last year to reduce pollution from cars and sports utility vehicles. Together, these measures will preserve our environment and protect thousands of children from the agony of asthma and other respiratory diseases. By the end of the decade, because of these steps, every new vehicle sold in the United States will be up to 95 percent cleaner than those rolling off the assembly line today.

Again, this was the right, real choice, proving once again that we can grow the economy and improve the environment at the same time. And I want to thank Carol Browner for her work on this. She's here. Thank you.

Now, in a few moments it will be my honor to sign the very last budget bill I will sign as President. And in so many ways, it could truly be said, we saved the best for last. This bill is called the Labor-HHS appropriation bill. But more than anything else, it's a bill about these children behind me today, about their hopes, their dreams, their capacity to learn, and their need to learn about their future and the future of our country. Again, it is further proof, as the evidence of these distinguished Members of Congress from both parties prove, that when we put progress ahead of partisanship, there's no limit to what we can do for America and our future.

We are now in the longest economic expansion in our history. A critical part of our strategy to get there was to put our fiscal house in order, to replace record deficits with record surpluses. With this budget, in spite of the investments—and I would argue because, in part, of past investments—we are going to be able to pay off another \$200 billion of our national debt, on track to paying down \$560 billion of the national debt over the last 4 years and this year. And because together we made the right, real choices, we

were able to increase investment in the things that matter most. That's what this budget bill does today.

And let me just begin with education. Under Secretary Riley's leadership, we have worked hard to make the right, real choice—to have more investment and higher standards, more accountability, and spend the money on the things that the educators tell us work best. Test scores are up today, with some of the greatest gains coming in some of the most disadvantaged communities. Two-thirds of our high school graduates are going on to college; that's up 10 percent from 1993. In the last few years, there has been a 300-percent increase in the number of Hispanic students taking advanced placement courses and a 500-percent increase in the number of African-American students doing so.

With the largest student enrollment in our entire history, and the most diverse student body in our entire history, education must be priority number one for any administration. With this budget, while turning the largest deficits in history into the largest surpluses, we also will have more than doubled funding for education during the life of this administration. This clearly is the biggest and best education budget in our Nation's history, and it will make a difference in the lives of millions of young people. Let me just give a couple of examples.

Our first-ever initiative to renovate classrooms will mean that, over time, millions of children will attend more modern, more dignified, more functional schools. This is about moving out of house trailers, and it's about going to school in old buildings that provide modern education.

With \$1.6 billion on its way to help communities with smaller classrooms, we will help roughly 2 million children learn in smaller classes, with more individualized attention in the early grades. With nearly \$1 billion more for Head Start, the largest increase in history, we'll have more than doubled the program, adding 60,000 more kids to this quality preschool program this year alone.

There is a dramatic increase in child care in this budget that, along with the child care funds provided in welfare reform, will help

more than 2.2 million kids next year, an increase in nearly a million just since 1997. By over doubling funding for after-school programs, we are providing 650,000 more students with a safe place to learn, bringing to 1.3 million the number of young people benefiting from this after-school initiative, something that did not even exist 4 years ago.

With another major increase in the GEAR UP program, 1.2 million disadvantaged children will now be preparing for college as early as the sixth grade. Together with one of the largest increases in the TRIO program ever, we are building greater pathways to college for economically disadvantaged young people.

This bill has the largest increase ever in Pell grants. We've now increased the maximum grant by nearly \$1,500 since 1993, for 4 million young people every year from low and moderate income families. This significant expansion of Pell grants is part of the biggest expansion in college aid since the GI bill, including the direct student loan program, which has saved students \$8 billion already in loan repayment costs, and the HOPE scholarship tax cut, which 10 million families are benefiting from this year.

I want to say to all of you who worked on this—to Chairman Goodling and Mr. Kildeer, Mr. Obey, all the other Members of the House; and to you, Senator Specter, and the other Senators who are here; and most of all to you, Secretary Riley, who is now the longest serving and, I believe, clearly the finest Education Secretary our country ever had—I thank you all very much. Thank you. This education budget is a real tribute to the bipartisan work of this Congress, and I am very grateful.

The budget also makes good on our commitment to help every community share in our Nation's prosperity. This is a big deal to me, and also to America's future. About 18 months ago, I began the first of what I called new markets tours, to shine a spotlight on people and places that had been left behind in this long and remarkable recovery. I wanted every American investor to see the potential of these communities and the promise of the people who live there.

I knew that government couldn't do it alone and that, in fact, we would have to find

a way to get more private investment into these communities. But I also knew that business could not be expected to go it alone, that we had to find some way to bring hope and opportunity home to these communities.

Now, at the same time, to be fair, there were people in the Congress who were interested in this who were struggling for some bipartisan consensus to bring free enterprise to parts of America that have been left behind. Among them, in the House, were Representative Talent, who is here, and J.C. Watts and Danny Davis, who represents Chicago but, like me, was born in Arkansas. And there were other groups that were looking at this.

So we all worked together to give you a budget that delivers something that I believe is truly unique and significant. It includes the landmark new markets and community renewal initiative. It's the most significant effort ever to help hard-pressed areas, both rural and urban, to lift themselves up through private investment and entrepreneurship. It is a triumph of bipartisanship. And again, I want to thank those whom I just mentioned—especially you, Mr. Talent—and I want to thank the Speaker of the House, Dennis Hastert, who went to Chicago with me and Reverend Jackson and without whom we could not have passed this important initiative.

Here's what it does. First, it establishes the first-ever new markets tax credit. It sets up a new market venture capital initiative. Now, what does all that mean? It basically means if we can get people to put money into really depressed areas, all the rest of America will share part of the risk by giving them a tax credit to do it. And it's a darn good investment.

We also expanded and strengthened 40 empowerment zones; that's the program our administration has run for the last 8 years under the able leadership of Vice President Gore. And we created 40 renewal communities across our Nation; that's an alternative designed essentially by Republicans in the House, with the Democrats who worked with them. And we decided that since nobody knows how to do this, we ought to try in 40 places with each approach and see which one works better, and see what works better with

each approach. It's a terrific idea, and I only wish I was going to be around when all the results come in. *[Laughter]*

But over the next—sometime over the next, I'd say, 2 to 4 years, probably more like a 4-year period, we'll actually have evidence of what happened in the 40 empowerment zones, what happened in the 40 renewal communities. That Congress will take the evidence and, I hope, as a result of that evidence, will then enact legislation that will permanently establish a framework for always encouraging America to invest in the areas that otherwise would be left behind.

And if, like me, you've spent a lot of time in the Mississippi Delta or Appalachia or inner-city neighborhoods or on Native American reservations, you doubtless have concluded, as I have, that intelligence is pretty equally distributed throughout this country and so is the work ethic. But we have not yet equally distributed opportunity and access to capital. We're trying to figure out how to do it. This is a truly historic day, and we did it together, and I am very grateful. Thank you.

This budget also does more to improve health care and to strengthen families and community. And again, I want to thank the Members of Congress who are here who had primary responsibility for the health care issues, and Secretary Shalala, who has also been with me from day one. And we were together yesterday with our sweeping health care privacy announcement. She may be the only one of us that is absolutely convinced she is getting a promotion, because she's going to become president of the University of Miami—*[laughter]*—and she gets a football team, which she does not have in her present job. Thank you.

This budget includes options for States to enroll tens of thousands of uninsured children in the Medicaid program by using schools, public housing, and other sites easily acceptable to parents and children.

Let me explain why this is important. We have got 2.5—since the Congress—in the balanced budget bill, Congress adopted the CHIP program, the Children's Health Insurance Program, 1997. Since then, 2.5 million \*

---

\* White House correction

kids have been enrolled. And as a result, this year, for the first time in 12 years, the number of people without health insurance in the United States went down—for the first time in 12 years. But the money is there for five million kids to be enrolled. And we know, from the evidence of all of the States that have been particularly vigorous, that if we can just find the kids, their parents will sign up.

This program provides funds so that we can do CHIP enrollment in schools, public housing, and other places where the people are. It also provides options for States to help low-income seniors enroll in programs that cover their Medicare premiums and copayments. It provides critical support to those moving from welfare to work by ensuring that working does not mean losing your health care. It ensures quality health care services for people on Medicare by investing about \$30 billion in hospitals, home health agencies, hospices, nursing homes, and managed care plans.

And this is very important. I admire the Congress for doing this. We adopted the Balanced Budget Act in '97. We adopted some substantive changes in our Medicare program that we thought would produce a certain level of savings. They produced more savings than we estimated, at great cost to the quality of health care, or the capacity of our providers to do it. So they asked us to make some corrections, and we did. And that's what this is. It's a very, very good thing for America.

The other thing this bill does, that I think will be very important to people for a very long time, is that it expands preventive benefits like cancer and glaucoma screenings for Medicare beneficiaries. It creates a new program to provide people with disabilities with community-based health care services, and it increases fundings for AIDS prevention, research, and treatment.

Also, it includes a \$20.3 billion investment in biomedical research, nearly doubling since 1993 our investment in the National Institutes of Health. And I would like to say a special word of thanks to a retiring Member of Congress, Representative John Porter, who's been a great leader in this. Thank you very much.

The bill provides \$11.9 billion in funding for the Department of Labor, for funding from job training to eliminating abusive child labor practices and promoting education around the world. Nearly 900,000 dislocated workers will receive support and assistance in their efforts to return to work.

Secretary Herman's here. I'd like to thank her for many things, and 8 years of service in this administration, 4 in the White House and then as Secretary of Labor. But one of the relatively little noticed but, I think, profoundly important initiatives that this administration has undertaken is to try to eliminate abusive child labor in the United States and everywhere it exists in the world. And I thank you for your leadership in that regard. I thank you very much.

Finally, the bill would allow nearly 700,000 immigrants who have worked, lived, and paid taxes in the United States for years to stay here legally without fear of being separated from their families.

When I outlined our budget priorities in the State of the Union last January, I urged Congress to work with me to pass a fiscally responsible budget that would be true to our values and invest in the capacity and future of the American people. I recall the good advice of President Theodore Roosevelt, who said that a growing nation with a future takes the long look ahead. This budget takes the long look ahead, to educate our children, renew our communities, and build our common future. I am very proud of it and very grateful. If we stay on this course, our best days are ahead.

Thank you very much. Now I'd like the Congress and the members of the administration to come up.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:03 p.m. in Presidential Hall in the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building. H.R. 4577, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001, approved December 21, incorporating H.R. 5656, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, was assigned Public Law No. 106-554. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Statement on Signing the  
Consolidated Appropriations  
Act, FY 2001**

*December 21, 2000*

I have signed into law H.R. 4577, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY 2001. I am pleased that my Administration and the Congress were able to reach agreement on the remaining appropriations bills and produce a hard-won victory for the American people.

The legislation reflects my Administration's longstanding commitment to education, worker training and assistance, and medical research, and continued opposition to unrelated anti-environmental riders, which have no place in these appropriation bills. As a result of extensive negotiations, my Administration was able to secure significant funding increases for many programs that represent significant victories for the American people, including teacher training, class size reduction, worker protection programs, and mental health programs.

I am very pleased that the legislation creates a new \$1.2 billion school renovation grant program, targeted to high-need districts. It provides \$0.9 billion for urgent school repairs, including \$75 million for public schools with high concentrations of Native American students, \$0.3 billion for special education and technology-related activities, and \$25 million for a demonstration program to assist charter schools in obtaining non-Federal financing for their infrastructure needs. The initiative will enable schools to undertake much-needed renovation, such as repairs to roofs, heating and cooling systems, and electrical wiring.

The bill also provides \$1.6 billion for the third installment of my plan to help reduce class size in the early grades. While the Republican proposal did not guarantee funding for the teachers already hired and would have instead allowed Class Size dollars to be used for virtually any activity, I am pleased that the bill that I have signed provides \$1.6 billion for Class Size Reduction, enough to support the over 29,000 teachers already hired, plus an additional 8,000 teachers.

I am also pleased that the budget agreement provides \$567 million for my Teaching to High Standards plan to improve teacher

preparation and help train teachers to meet higher standards. This funding level is \$194 million more than last year's level. The bill includes \$485 million for Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants, providing training for as many as 2.3 million teachers and strengthening accountability by requiring that States and districts use new Eisenhower funds to reduce the number of uncertified teachers in their schools. The bill also provides \$44 million for new national-level activities, including initiatives to train early childhood educators and measures to recruit talented mid-career professionals into teaching.

The legislation provides \$846 million for 21st Century Community Learning Centers to support after school and summer school programs that make extended learning opportunities available for students and offer a safe place for "latch-key" children to learn during the after-school hours. At this funding level, nearly 650,000 more students than last year will have access to these services.

I am very pleased that Title I Grants to Local Education Agencies are funded at \$8.4 billion, an increase of \$0.4 billion more than last year, to continue efforts to help disadvantaged students catch up with their peers. In addition, the bill supports my Accountability Fund proposal by providing \$225 million, an increase of \$91 million, to help States turn around the lowest-performing schools and hold schools accountable for results. This funding level will provide help to 4,500 schools, an increase of 1,800 over last year.

I am pleased that the bill provides an increase in funding to \$286 million for the Reading Excellence Initiative. This program supports literacy services for children, including local reading programs, teacher training, tutoring programs, and family literacy services. With this funding, all the remaining States and territories will be able to receive grants, bringing the number of children served to 3.1 million.

I am pleased that the budget agreement provides \$872 million for educational technology that will be used to fund programs that train an additional 110,000 teachers to effectively use modern technology in the classroom. The bill also provides a \$32 million increase for Community Technology

Centers, creating up to 650 centers that provide access to computers and Information Age tools to children and adults that cannot afford them at home.

The bill includes \$125 million for the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools program, \$80 million above the FY 2000 enacted level. The additional funds will help over 1,000 of the Nation's high schools implement smaller, more intimate learning environments through reforms like schools-within-schools and career academies.

I strongly support the \$190 million provided in the legislation for the Charter Schools program. The additional funds will support the startup of nearly 500 new or re-designed schools that offer enhanced public school choice and the freedom to pursue innovative educational programs. At the beginning of my Administration, there was only one charter school. With this increase, the Charter School program will have supported over 2,800 charter schools.

I also support the \$644 million provided in the bill for Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities programs. Within this amount, the bill contains \$35 million to expand the Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative; \$50 million for the middle school Coordinator Initiative; and \$10 million for Project School Emergency Response to Violence, to provide emergency assistance, such as crisis counseling and increased security, to school districts that experience a violent or traumatic crisis.

I strongly support the \$7.4 billion for Special Education programs, an increase of \$1.4 billion over the FY 2000 enacted level. Included in this total is \$6.3 billion for Special Education State Grants. The bill also provides my requested increase for Grants for Infants and Families, for a total of \$384 million.

I am very pleased that the bill contains a major increase in funding for Pell Grants. The bill provides \$8.8 billion to support a \$3,750 maximum award.

The bill includes \$295 million for GEAR-UP. Compared to last year, this funding level provides needed college preparation services to nearly 500,000 more low-income students. Equally important is the funding provided in the bill for TRIO, which receives \$730 mil-

lion and will help 765,000 disadvantaged students attend and complete college.

I am pleased that the Congress fully funded my \$1 billion request for Federal Work-Study. This level continues to enable one million students to work their way through college.

I am pleased that the legislation provides over \$1 billion in increases to programs included in my Administration's Hispanic Education Action Plan (HEAP). These programs help to improve overall the educational outcomes of Latino and limited English proficient students by increasing their levels of academic achievement, high school graduation, post-secondary participation, and opportunities for lifelong learning.

I commend the Congress for including \$70 million for my English Language/Civics Initiative, nearly triple last year's funding. This program helps States and communities provide recent immigrants and other limited English proficient individuals with expanded access to quality English-language instruction linked to civics education, including understanding the U.S. Government and public education systems, the workplace, and other key institutions of American life. Funding for this initiative in FY 2001 will provide services for almost 250,000 individuals.

The bill includes \$306 million for Education Research, Statistics, and Assessment. The funds will provide additional support for the Interagency Educational Research Initiative, the new Birth Cohort of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, and new grants for the Initiative on Language Minority Students, a program that seeks better ways to educate children whose first language is not English.

The bill provides \$11.9 billion in discretionary funds for the Department of Labor (DOL), a \$0.7 billion increase above the FY 2000 enacted level. The funding provided supports my major proposals for job training, worker protection programs, and grants for working with developing countries to eliminate abusive child labor.

I am pleased that the legislation provides \$1.6 billion for dislocated worker assistance. The program will provide training and re-employment services to 883,000 dislocated workers. Since FY 1993, my Administration



has succeeded in almost tripling funding for, and participation in, programs that help dislocated workers return to work. In addition, the bill includes \$35 million of the \$50 million I requested to provide job-finding assistance to 156,000 unemployment insurance claimants to speed their reentry into the workforce.

The bill provides nearly my full request to expand services to job seekers at One-Stop centers as recently authorized in the bipartisan Workforce Investment Act (WIA). The bill funds \$150 million of the \$154 million requested to provide improved access to One-Stops as well as continued support for electronic labor exchange and labor market information. The enrolled bill also fully funds my \$20 million request for work incentive grants to help integrate employment services for persons with disabilities into the mainstream One-Stop system.

The bill provides \$55 million for the Responsible Reintegration of Youth Offenders (RRYO) initiative. RRYO will bring roughly 10,300 young ex-offenders into the workplace through job training, placement, and support services, and by creating new partnerships between the criminal justice system and the WIA system. In addition, the enrolled bill includes \$20 million to enable DOL to contribute to the Safe Schools/Healthy Students joint initiative with the Departments of Justice, Education, and Health and Human Services that will expand efforts to address out-of-school youth.

The enrolled bill also provides additional funding for other youth job training programs. Specifically the bill includes \$275 million for the Youth Opportunity Grants program to finance the third year of five-year competitive grants that provide education, training and support services to 63,000 youth in Empowerment Zones/Empowerment Communities (EZ/ECs). In addition, the bill provides \$1.1 billion for the Youth Activities Formula Grants to provide training and employment opportunities to an estimated 660,000 youth in FY 2001.

I am disappointed that the Congress has not provided \$255 million as requested for the Fathers Work/Families Win initiative. As a result, 80,000 non-custodial and low-

income parents will not get the additional support to get a job or upgrade their skills.

The bill provides \$148 million for the Bureau of International Labor Affairs, an increase of \$78 million, or 112 percent, above last year's level. The legislation provides a total of \$82 million for efforts to address international child labor issues. I am pleased that my \$45 million request to expand the work of the International Labor Organization's International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labor was fully funded and that the bill provides \$37 million to support my new bilateral assistance initiative to improve access to basic education in developing countries.

The legislation also provides \$23 million to establish the Office of Disability Policy, Evaluation and Technical Assistance. Headed by a new Assistant Secretary, this office will provide leadership in helping people with disabilities enter, re-enter, and remain in the workforce. In addition, I am pleased that the bill includes \$60 million to administer the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program to help workers who have developed illnesses associated with nuclear weapons production and testing.

The bill provides the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) with \$49.9 billion in funding, \$7.1 billion above the FY 2000 level.

I commend the Congress for fully funding my request of \$817 million for the Child Care and Development Block Grant, bringing the total level of the block grant to \$2 billion in FY 2001 and allowing nearly 150,000 additional children to be served. The bill also authorizes and provides \$20 million for the Early Learning Opportunities Act, which is similar to my Early Learning Fund proposal. Early Learning funds may be used to improve child care quality and promote school readiness through activities such as training parents to facilitate cognitive development and offering training, recruitment, and retention incentives for child care professionals.

The enrolled bill provides the largest increase for Head Start in the program's history. An increase of \$93 million over the FY 2000 enacted level will bring total program funding to \$6.2 billion, adding approximately

60,000 new slots for low-income children and continuing on the path to serve one million kids by FY 2002.

I am pleased that the enrolled bill fully funds the Family Caregivers program established in the recently reauthorized Older Americans Act at \$125 million. The program will provide information, respite care, and other support services to 250,000 families caring for loved ones who are ill or disabled.

The enrolled bill increases Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program funds by \$300 million for total non-emergency program funding of \$1.4 billion. These additional funds will help low-income families cope with continued high heating fuel prices. The bill also provides \$300 million in contingent emergency funds.

I strongly support the increase of \$2.5 billion, or 14 percent, over the FY 2000 level provided to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) for biomedical research. The \$20.3 billion will enable NIH to continue to pursue new methods for diagnosing, treating, and curing diseases such as cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's, and HIV/AIDS. The bill also provides \$130 million for the newly-established Center for Research on Minority Health and Health Disparities, which will coordinate and support NIH's trans-Institute, billion dollar research portfolio on minority health.

The bill provides \$3.9 billion for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The increased funds will support: \$163 million for domestic and global HIV/AIDS prevention efforts; \$78 million to improve childhood immunizations; \$67 million for infectious disease activities; \$37 million for the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health; and \$18 million for breast and cervical cancer screening activities.

I am pleased that this legislation provides \$357 million for the Congressional Black Caucus HIV/AIDS initiative, an increase of \$105 million above the FY 2000 enacted level of \$252 million. This will support an expanded scope of HIV/AIDS prevention, education, treatment, and outreach activities for minority community-based organizations working to slow the spread of HIV/AIDS in their communities.

I support the \$5.6 billion provided to the Health Resources and Services Administra-

tion, \$1 billion above the FY 2000 enacted level and \$890 million above the FY 2001 request. Increases over the FY 2000 level include: \$100 million to continue funding demonstration projects that address health care access for the uninsured; \$15 million for Family Planning; \$213 million for Ryan White activities; \$150 million for Community Health Centers; and, \$195 million for Children's Hospitals Graduate Medical Education. In addition, I am pleased that the bill provides \$550 million for the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Act so that additional relief payments may be made to hemophiliacs who contracted HIV/AIDS, and their families.

The bill provides \$2.9 billion for Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services. Mental Health increases over the FY 2000 enacted level total \$151 million, including \$64 million for the Mental Health Block Grant, and \$25 million in new targeted grants for early intervention and prevention, as well as local capacity expansion. Substance abuse increases over the FY 2000 level total \$135 million, including \$65 million for the Substance Abuse Block Grant, \$42 million for substance abuse treatment grants and \$28 million for substance abuse prevention grants.

The bill invests \$50 million in Real Choice Systems Change Grants to help States develop comprehensive plans to care for persons with disabilities in the most appropriate setting. These funds would be used to do the following: conduct intensive outreach efforts to educate people with disabilities about the home and community-based options currently available to them; streamline application and eligibility processes for home- and community-based care services; and modify State policy that results in the unnecessary institutionalization of people with disabilities.

The bill includes \$79 million for my Nursing Home Initiative, a \$32 million, or 68 percent, increase over the FY 2000 enacted level. This funding provides \$66 million for more rigorous inspections of nursing facilities and improved Federal oversight of nursing home quality, and grants to the States to develop ways for the disabled to move into community-based care rather than nursing homes. Congress also provided \$13.5 million for HHS' Office of the General Counsel and

Departmental Appeals Board to address the backlog of nursing home appeals and handle increased legal advice, litigation support, and hearings on nursing home enforcement cases.

The bill provides a program level of \$270 million to the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, \$70 million over the FY 2000 level, to expand research on the costs, uses, and quality of health care, and to enhance the Medical Expenditures Panel Surveys. This includes \$50 million for research on patient safety and the reduction of medical errors and \$10 million for research on health care worker safety.

I support the \$326 million to expand HHS' bioterrorism initiative. Congress fully funded my request of \$52 million for CDC's national pharmaceutical stockpile and provided \$168 million for CDC to expand national, State, and local epidemiologic laboratories, surveillance capacity for biological agents, strategic planning, and capabilities to screen toxicants.

The bill provides the Health Care Financing Administration's (HCFA's) program management with a total program level of \$2.3 billion, \$173 million, or eight percent, over the FY 2000 enacted level. This funding will support HCFA's efforts to strengthen its oversight of Medicare contractors and efforts to ensure the quality and safety of nursing homes, non-accredited hospitals and other facilities. Funding is included for the National Medicare Education Program that educates beneficiaries, enabling them to make informed health decisions on topics like managed care, long-term care and supplemental insurance.

I am pleased that bill language was modified to allow the Secretary of Commerce to issue regulations in January that will protect the endangered Steller sea lion, not undermine the Endangered Species Act, and allow an appropriate level of fishing to resume in the affected Alaska fisheries. In addition, the bill provides \$50 million for research into the recovery of Steller sea lions, and for economic assistance to Alaskan fishing communities that may experience economic impacts from the new regulations. The bill sustains my Administration's longstanding commitment to protect the Nation's environmental

laws from inappropriate and unrelated anti-environmental riders.

I am pleased that the bill does not include language prohibiting the promulgation of the Department of Labor's ergonomics standard. The standard, which was promulgated last month, seeks to prevent work-related injuries arising from risk factors such as repetitive motion or overexertion.

The bill extends the current availability period for Welfare-to-Work grant funds for an additional two years, allowing grantees the chance to take advantage of eligibility changes made in the FY 2000 Appropriations Act.

I am also pleased that the bill includes a provision to compensate beneficiaries of Federal programs who experienced a shortfall in their benefit payments as a result of the understatement of the Consumer Price Index that occurred in 1999. The bill provides that any compensation payments will be disregarded as income for purposes of means-tested programs. The bill also provides that the corrected CPI series for 1999 be taken into account for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code, effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

I am very pleased that the legislation does not include language that would have restricted public health funds for emergency contraception health services in primary and secondary schools. I was strongly opposed to this language because decisions about what kinds of services should be provided in school settings are more appropriately left to local decisionmakers, who can take into consideration their community's health needs.

I am very disappointed that Congress has mandated that all schools and libraries receiving Federal educational technology funds implement Internet filtering technology. Under the provisions of this bill, noncompliant schools and libraries will be ineligible for E-rate discounts and other Federal technology funds. My Administration has actively promoted the protection of children from harmful materials on the Internet, and I have been a strong supporter of locally driven efforts to make our schools and libraries safe portals for students to explore the World Wide Web. Because of the importance of

protecting children from inappropriate material online, I believe that local development and implementation of an Internet-acceptable use plan is a more effective, appropriate solution than mandatory filtering for ensuring comprehensive protection while meeting the diverse needs of local schools and libraries. Although I am pleased that the required technological protection measures will be included as part of a locally developed policy, I would have preferred to allow communities more flexibility in developing appropriate policies by not imposing this potentially expensive and restrictive requirement. I am also concerned that because current technology may not be able to differentiate between harmful and non-harmful expression with precision, these provisions may have the effect of limiting access to valuable information in a manner that offends our tradition of freedom of speech. We will seek to implement the policy in a way that maximizes local flexibility and minimizes local burdens within the framework of the statute.

The bill includes a provision making clear that religious organizations may qualify for substance abuse prevention and treatment grants from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) on the same basis as other nonprofit organizations. The Department of Justice advises, however, that this provision would be unconstitutional to the extent that it were construed to permit governmental funding of organizations that do not or cannot separate their religious activities from their substance abuse treatment and prevention activities that are supported by SAMHSA aid. Accordingly, I construe the bill as forbidding the funding of such organizations and as permitting Federal, State, and local governments involved in disbursing SAMHSA funds to take into account the structure and operations of a religious organization in determining whether such an organization is constitutionally and statutorily eligible to receive funding.

I am also pleased that, unlike earlier versions of the bill, the final bill excludes or modifies many provisions that would have changed our environmental protection and natural resource conservation laws without adequate public and congressional scrutiny.

In particular, I am satisfied that a provision restricting the regulation of snowmobile use in national parks has been sufficiently modified to allow completion of a pending rule for Yellowstone National Park and two adjacent parks, so long as that rule does not reduce snowmobile use during the first two winter seasons.

The bill fully funds my IRS modernization and reform program for FY 2001. However, Congress denied a requested FY 2002 advance appropriation of \$422 million for IRS technology modernization. In addition, the bill provides only \$141 million of my \$225 million request for enhanced staffing to improve tax compliance and customer service activities.

I am pleased that the bill includes \$185 million for the Office of National Drug Control Policy's National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign, as well as \$207 million for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas.

I am very disappointed that the bill continues objectionable current law provisions that restrict Federal Employees Health Benefit Program (FEHBP) coverage for abortions except in the cases where the life of the mother is endangered or the pregnancy is a result of rape or incest. The bill continues current law requirements that health plans participating in the FEHBP that provide prescription drug coverage must also provide prescription contraceptive coverage.

I am pleased that the bill provides funding and authority for priority agricultural conservation programs, including \$26 million for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program and authority to spend existing funds on the Farmland Protection Program. These programs will improve our environment and protect our Nation's open spaces while boosting farm income.

There are several authorization bills included in H.R. 4577, including the Medicare, Medicaid, and the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) Benefits Improvement and Protection Act. This legislation provides States with increased allotments aimed at assisting hospitals serving significant numbers of low-income and uninsured patients; makes it easier for States to enroll uninsured children in Medicaid and SCHIP by permitting enrollment through

schools, child support enforcement agencies, homeless shelters, program eligibility offices, and certain other sites; increases Medicaid reimbursements for federally qualified health centers and rural health centers; and directs HHS to issue the final Medicaid upper payment limit rule by December 31, 2000. The bill provides an additional \$70 million in FYs 2001 and 2002 and \$100 million in FY 2003 for the special diabetes programs at the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Indian Health Service.

The legislation also includes a two-year extension of the medical savings accounts program, which allows employers to make tax exempt contributions on behalf of employees to cover medical expenses.

I am disappointed that the bill fails to include my proposals to expand coverage to uninsured families; restore Medicaid and SCHIP benefits to immigrant pregnant women, children, and disabled individuals; and improve equity in Medicaid by allowing States to serve individuals in their homes and communities rather than in nursing homes. I am also disappointed that the bill does not include my proposal to bring payment rates for hospital services in Puerto Rico more in line with the rates that apply elsewhere in the country.

H.R. 4577 includes tax incentives and programs to help low-income people in distressed communities by encouraging private sector partners to increase investment and growth in low-income communities.

I am pleased that the bill includes the creation of a New Market tax incentive for investors that invest in equity investments in qualified low-income communities; an increase in the low-income housing volume caps for tax-exempt private activity bonds; and an expansion of eligibility for the brownfields tax incentive to cover all contaminated sites certified by a State, other than sites on the Superfund National Priorities List, and an extension through 2003.

The bill amends the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) to provide regulatory relief for investors and authorize appropriations of such sums as are necessary to carry out the CEA for FYs 2001–2005. The bill would deregulate most over-the-counter derivatives (finan-

cial instruments whose value depends on the value or change in value of an underlying security, commodity, or asset) traded electronically between sophisticated entities such as banks, broker/dealers, and high-net-worth individuals.

I support the reauthorization of a number of Small Business Administration programs in the bill, including my proposal to increase the number of small loans below \$150,000, reduce borrower fees, and improve technical assistance programs available to microentrepreneurs. The bill would also extend the authority for a number of expiring programs such as the Small Business Innovation Research and Small Disadvantaged Business programs. Finally, the bill authorizes the New Markets Venture Capital, New Markets Technical Assistance, and BusinessLINC programs, which provide authority for \$250 million in public and private capital for rural and urban small business investments, technical assistance, and mentoring services for aspiring entrepreneurs. The bill also authorizes establishment of a set-aside program for women-owned small businesses that are classified as economically disadvantaged or in an industry in which women owned businesses are substantially underrepresented.

I am pleased that this legislation amends immigration provisions included in the Commerce/Justice/State Appropriations Act thereby easing immigration restrictions on an estimated 700,000 immigrant families living in the United States. The provisions would extend section 245(i) until April 30, 2001, to allow aliens (and their spouses and children) who apply for an adjustment of status or a labor certification to remain in the United States until such petition is approved. Additionally, the provisions would create a new, temporary non-immigrant visa for spouses and children of spouses of legal permanent residents and U.S. citizens seeking to enter the United States to await approval of legal permanent resident status for themselves (the “V” visa). The provisions would also allow certain individuals who were not granted amnesty under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 who are currently seeking such relief through the courts to apply for permanent residency. While I am disappointed that the legislation fails to

eliminate the disparate treatment under our immigration laws sought for Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Hondurans, Haitians, and Liberians and does not provide any relief for deserving individuals affected by changes in the 1996 immigration law, it is the best compromise that could be reached after several rounds of intense negotiations.

H.R. 4577 also includes authorization for the Delta Regional Authority (DRA), a newly created agency that will focus \$20 million for area development and technical assistance on distressed counties in the Mississippi Delta Region. The authorization will permit the establishment of the DRA which will work to improve the economic status of some of our Nation's most impoverished communities.

There are provisions in the Act that purport to condition my authority or that of certain officers to use funds appropriated by the Act on the approval of congressional committees. My Administration will interpret such provisions to require notification only, since any other interpretation would contradict the Supreme Court ruling in *INS v. Chadha*.

Section 620 of the Treasury/General Government Appropriations section of the Act prohibits the use of appropriations to pay the salary of any Federal Government officer or employee who interferes with certain communications between Federal employees and Members of Congress. I do not interpret this provision to detract from my constitutional authority and that of my appointed heads of departments to supervise and control the operations and communications of the executive branch, including the control of privileged and national security information.

Another provision of the Act raises Appointments Clause concerns. Subsection 111(b) of the Small Business Reauthorization Act of 2000 portion of the bill provides joint grant-making authority to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, who is a constitutional officer, and to two other officials, who are not. In order to avoid an Appointments Clause problem raised by this provision, I will interpret that subsection as giving the Administrator the final say concerning selection of grant recipients after consultation with the other designated officials.

Section 313 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations portion of the Act would establish in the legislative branch a "Center for Russian Leadership Development." The principal function of the Center would be to administer a grant program to support visits to this country by Russian nationals. I fully support the goals of this grant program. The Department of Justice advises me, however, that because the program is not administered by the executive branch, it is unconstitutional. I urge the Congress to enact new legislation reassigning the Center to an executive branch agency.

Several provisions of the Act also raise concerns under the Recommendations Clause. These provisions purport to require a Cabinet Secretary or other Administration official to make recommendations to Congress on changes in law. To the extent that those provisions would require Administration officials to provide Congress with policy recommendations or draft legislation, I direct these officials to treat any such requirements as precatory.

In addition, I hereby designate the following amounts as emergency requirements for the Department of Defense, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control act of 1985, as amended: \$100,000,000 provided to the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer account and \$150,000,000 provided to the Operations and Maintenance, Navy account in H.R. 5666, as enacted by H.R. 4577.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
December 21, 2000.

NOTE: H.R. 4577, approved December 21, was assigned Public Law No. 106-554. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 22. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

## **The President's Radio Address**

*December 23, 2000*

Good morning. This weekend we not only celebrate the first Christmas of the new millennium; we also celebrate an America

blessed with the gift of unprecedented prosperity and progress.

We're in the midst of the longest economic expansion in our Nation's history, with record surpluses, more than 22 million new jobs, the lowest unemployment in history, and the lowest Hispanic- and African-American unemployment ever recorded.

We have strengthened the cornerstone of the American dream along the way: the chance to own a home. Today, we have the highest homeownership in our Nation's history with record levels of minority homeownership. And more Americans than ever are celebrating that gift this holiday season.

Over the last 8 years, Vice President Gore and I have worked hard to give nearly 10 million more families the opportunity to own their own homes by cutting redtape, speeding up loans, making financing available for families who were too often locked out of the market, creating more opportunity and choice for families who live in assisted housing.

In the last 3 years, our administration has secured nearly 200,000 new housing vouchers to help hard-pressed families find decent and affordable housing. I want to especially thank our HUD Secretary, Andrew Cuomo, for his extraordinary commitment to making affordable housing accessible to citizens who need it most.

Today we're introducing new measures to more fully integrate public housing, so families from different social and economic walks of life have the chance to live in diverse communities. In addition to expanding opportunity for more Americans, this will also help to break down destructive barriers of race and class.

We're also taking action to increase loan limits from the Federal Housing Administration by nearly 9 percent to help more working families to own their first home. Since 1993, the FHA program has given more than 4 million Americans that chance. We have made real progress.

But too many Americans still will be spending this Christmas without a roof over their heads. That's why we've helped to move thousands of families off the street. Yet, there still are more than a half million men, women, and children whose only home every

night is a neighborhood shelter or a park bench.

In this time of unparalleled prosperity, we must do more to help them. Today I'm pleased to announce \$1 billion in new grants to help more than 200,000 homeless people along the path to self-sufficiency. This is the largest amount ever dedicated to helping homeless Americans rebuild their lives.

The grants will fund proven successful programs like Continuum of Care, which helps homeless families with transitional and permanent housing, drug treatment and medication, job training, and child care. It also funds efforts like the Emergency Shelter Grants program, which provides for transitional housing and helps communities maintain emergency shelters.

Taken together, these grants are a gift that will give back to us in many ways. They will empower communities to employ innovative solutions to helping homeless adults and their children, people like Juanita Price, a recovering drug addict who once spent her nights in abandoned buildings and hollowed-out cars. Thanks to the Continuum of Care program, Juanita found the support she needed and turned her life around. Today, she's got a steady job, an apartment, and she's studying to be a nurse at Howard University here in Washington, DC.

There are lots and lots of people like Juanita who could use a helping hand. Today we're lending that hand by giving more homeless Americans the tools they need to succeed, so that this Christmas they can find warmth inside a home, not from the top of a steam grate.

It is said in the Scripture: "I will appoint a place for my people so they may dwell in a place of their own and move no more." Today, in this season of hope and giving, we should redouble our efforts to ensure that every American can have a place of his or her own.

The steps we're taking now will create new opportunity for the homeless, for hard-pressed working families, and for those struggling to buy their first home. I can't think of any better way to celebrate this holiday season.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 4:40 p.m. on December 22 in the Oval Office at the White House for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on December 23. The transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 22 but was embargoed for release until the broadcast.

## **Executive Order 13182— Adjustments of Certain Rates of Pay**

*December 23, 2000*

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the laws cited herein, it is hereby ordered as follows:

**Section 1. Statutory Pay Systems.** The rates of basic pay or salaries of the statutory pay systems (as defined in 5 U.S.C. 5302(1)), as adjusted under 5 U.S.C. 5303(a), are set forth on the schedules attached hereto and made a part hereof:

- (a) The General Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5332(a)) at Schedule 1;
- (b) The Foreign Service Schedule (22 U.S.C. 3963) at Schedule 2; and
- (c) The schedules for the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs (38 U.S.C. 7306, 7404; section 301(a) of Public Law 102-40) at Schedule 3.

**Sec. 2. Senior Executive Service.** The rates of basic pay for senior executives in the Senior Executive Service, as adjusted under 5 U.S.C. 5382, are set forth on Schedule 4 attached hereto and made a part hereof.

**Sec. 3. Executive Salaries.** The rates of basic pay or salaries for the following offices and positions are set forth on the schedules attached hereto and made a part hereof:

- (a) The Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5312-5318) at Schedule 5;
- (b) The Vice President (3 U.S.C. 104) and the Congress (2 U.S.C. 31) at Schedule 6; and
- (c) Justices and judges (28 U.S.C. 5, 44(d), 135, 252, and 461(a)) at Schedule 7.

**Sec. 4. Uniformed Services.** Pursuant to section 601 of Public Law 106-398, the rates of monthly basic pay (37 U.S.C. 203(a)) for members of the uniformed services and the rate of monthly cadet or midshipman pay (37

U.S.C. 203(c)) are set forth on Schedule 8 attached hereto and made a part hereof.

**Sec. 5. Locality-Based Comparability Payments.** (a) Pursuant to sections 5304 and 5304a of title 5, United States Code, locality-based comparability payments shall be paid in accordance with Schedule 9 attached hereto and made a part hereof.

- (b) The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall take such actions as may be necessary to implement these payments and to publish appropriate notice of such payments in the *Federal Register*.

**Sec. 6. Administrative Law Judges.** The rates of basic pay for administrative law judges, as adjusted under 5 U.S.C. 5372(b)(4), are set forth on Schedule 10 attached hereto and made a part hereof.

**Sec. 7. Effective Dates.** Schedule 8 is effective on January 1, 2001. The other schedules contained herein are effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after January 1, 2001.

**Sec. 8. Prior Order Superseded.** Executive Order 13144 of December 21, 1999, is superseded.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
December 23, 2000.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., December 28, 2000]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on December 29.

## **Executive Order 13183— Establishment of the President's Task Force on Puerto Rico's Status**

*December 23, 2000*

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including Public Law 106-346, it is hereby ordered as follows:

**Section 1. Policy.** It is the policy of the executive branch of the Government of the United States of America to help answer the questions that the people of Puerto Rico have asked for years regarding the options for the



islands' future status and the process for realizing an option. Further, it is our policy to consider and develop positions on proposals, without preference among the options, for the Commonwealth's future status; to discuss such proposals with representatives of the people of Puerto Rico and the Congress; to work with leaders of the Commonwealth and the Congress to clarify the options to enable Puerto Ricans to determine their preference among options for the islands' future status that are not incompatible with the Constitution and basic laws and policies of the United States; and to implement such an option if chosen by a majority, including helping Puerto Ricans obtain a governing arrangement under which they would vote for national government officials, if they choose such a status.

**Sec. 2. The President's Task Force on Puerto Rico's Status.** There is established a task force to be known as "The President's Task Force on Puerto Rico's Status" (Task Force). It shall be composed of designees of each member of the President's Cabinet and the Co-Chairs of the President's Interagency Group on Puerto Rico (Interagency Group). The Task Force shall be co-chaired by the Attorney General's designee and a Co-Chair of the Interagency Group.

**Sec. 3. Functions.** The Task Force shall seek to implement the policy set forth in section 1 of this order. It shall ensure official attention to and facilitate action on matters related to proposals for Puerto Rico's status and the process by which an option can be realized. It shall provide advice and recommendations on such matters to the President and the Congress. It shall also provide advice and recommendations to assist the Executive Office of the President in fulfilling its responsibilities under Public Law 106-346 to transfer funding to the Elections Commission of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico for public education on and a public choice among options for Puerto Rico's future status that are not incompatible with the Constitution and the basic laws and policies of the United States.

**Sec. 4. Report.** The Task Force shall report on its actions to the President not later than May 1, 2001, and thereafter as needed but not less than annually on progress made

in the determination of Puerto Rico's ultimate status.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
December 23, 2000.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., December 28, 2000]

NOTE: This Executive order was published in the *Federal Register* on December 29.

### **Memorandum on Resolution of Puerto Rico's Status**

*December 23, 2000*

*Memorandum for the Heads of Executive  
Departments and Agencies*

*Subject:* Resolution of Puerto Rico's Status

Although Puerto Rico was acquired in connection with the Spanish-American War and United States citizenship is granted to persons born on the islands, Puerto Rico's ultimate status has not been determined. Until that issue is resolved, questions remain about how United States economic and social policies should apply to the citizens of Puerto Rico.

Further, although our citizens in Puerto Rico have been granted the exercise of authority on local matters similar to that of citizens of a State, they do not have voting representation in the Federal Government.

All three of Puerto Rico's major political parties are based on different visions of what the options for a fully democratic status are, and what the best status would be. And all advocate a substantial change in the islands' status. The Commonwealth held a referendum on options for its future status in December 1998, including the current governing arrangement, and other recognized options, but a majority of the vote was for a "None of the Above" column.

Much of the debate on the issue concerns what options are available to Puerto Rico, in light of the Constitution and the basic laws and policies of the United States. The elected representatives of the people of Puerto Rico have, therefore, repeatedly petitioned the Federal Government to clarify the islands' status options as well as the process by which

Puerto Ricans can determine the islands' future status.

The United States has a responsibility to answer such questions. Successive Presidents, and the Congress in 1998, have supported the people of Puerto Rico in determining their status preference from among options that are not incompatible with the Constitution and basic laws and policies of the United States. I have made it the policy of the executive branch to work with the leaders of the Commonwealth and the Congress to enable Puerto Ricans to choose their future status. We also have the responsibility to help Puerto Ricans obtain the necessary transitional legislation toward a new status, if chosen.

To ensure that the Federal Government continues to address the fundamental question concerning the islands until it is resolved, by the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including Public Law 106-346, I have today issued an Executive Order establishing the President's Task Force on Puerto Rico's Status (President's Task Force) and further direct as follows:

1. The Co-Chairs of the President's Task Force shall conduct an ongoing dialogue with the Governor and Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico's major political parties and other groups that advocate a change in the islands' status, and the Chairs and Ranking Minority Members of the House of Representatives Committee on Resources and the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. This dialogue shall focus on the options for Puerto Rico's future status and the process by which Puerto Ricans can realize such an option. It shall seek to facilitate communications among the offices that the aforementioned officials represent on matters relating to the status of the Commonwealth, and ensure official attention to, and facilitate action on, such matters. In particular, the dialogue shall seek to clarify the options for Puerto Rico's future status and enable Puerto Ricans to choose among those options.

2. The Co-Chairs of the President's Task Force shall monitor the expenditure of funds for public education on and a public choice among Puerto Rico's status options pursuant to Public Law 106-346. This monitoring shall include ensuring that educational materials are accurate, objective, and non-partisan and that they are consistent with the standards set forth in the Executive Order entitled "Establishment of the President's Task Force on Puerto Rico's Status."
3. The heads of executive departments and agencies shall cooperate with the Co-Chairs in fulfilling the assignments provided for herein and in the accompanying Executive Order.

**William J. Clinton**

### **Christmas Greeting to the Nation**

*December 24, 2000*

**The President.** On this holiest of holidays, Hillary and I would like to wish all of you a very Merry Christmas. Tonight we gather with family and friends to reflect on our good fortune, rejoice in the memories of the year past, and look forward with hope to the days ahead.

And we give thanks to America's men and women in uniform, who are spending this holiday protecting freedom around the world.

**The First Lady.** And we also remember those who are too often left behind, because Christmas isn't just about getting gifts; it's about the miracle of giving them. As we enjoy our last Christmas in the White House, the President, Chelsea, and I are profoundly grateful for the gift you've given our family, the privilege of serving your family these last 8 years.

**The President.** So from our family to yours, Merry Christmas, Happy New Year, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The greeting was videotaped at approximately 4 p.m. in the Map Room on December 19 for later broadcast, and the transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 22 but was embargoed for release until 12:01 a.m., December 24. These remarks were

also made available on the White House Press Office Actuality Line.

### **Christmas Greeting to the Nation**

*December 24, 2000*

**The President.** On this holiest of holidays, Hillary and I want to wish all of you a very Merry Christmas. Tonight we gather with family and friends to reflect on our good fortune, rejoice in memories of the year past, and look forward with hope to the days ahead.

**The First Lady.** From our family to yours, Merry Christmas, Happy New Year, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The greeting was videotaped at approximately 4 p.m. in the Map Room on December 19 for later broadcast, and the transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 22 but was embargoed for release until 12:01 a.m., December 24. These remarks were also made available on the White House Press Office Actuality Line.

### **Christmas Greeting to the Nation**

*December 24, 2000*

**The President.** Hillary and I want to wish all of you a very Merry Christmas. Tonight we gather with family and friends to reflect on our good fortune, rejoice in memories of the last year, and look forward with hope to the year ahead.

**The First Lady.** So from our family to yours, Merry Christmas, Happy New Year, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The greeting was videotaped at approximately 4 p.m. in the Map Room on December 19 for later broadcast, and the transcript was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 22 but was embargoed for release until 12:01 a.m., December 24. These remarks were also made available on the White House Press Office Actuality Line.

### **Statement on Signing the Shark Finning Prohibition Act**

*December 26, 2000*

I have signed H.R. 5461, the “Shark Finning Prohibition Act.” Shark-finning is the taking of a shark, removing the fin, and returning the carcass to the sea. This legislation prohibits shark-finning in all U.S. waters; provides for initiation of international negotiations to prohibit shark-finning; and authorizes research to conserve shark populations.

The Administration has actively supported the prohibition of shark-finning because of the harmful impact on sharks and shark populations. The practice has been administratively banned in the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Caribbean Sea. H.R. 5461 will establish the ban in law and extend it to the Pacific Ocean.

The United States has been a leading proponent of international shark conservation at the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization and has advocated prohibiting wasteful fishing practices, including shark finning. We have also demonstrated considerable leadership in other international fora to conserve sharks and ban shark-finning. In the Eastern Pacific, the United States has been active in the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission in dealing effectively with issues such as shark management on the high seas. And the United States has been participating, along with thirty other countries, in the High-Level Multilateral Conferences for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Species in the Western and Central Pacific. Finally, the United States plans to continue in its efforts at the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas to obtain a proposal that would ban shark-finning, as well as implement a variety of conservation measures.

Only through international cooperation can effective management be ensured for sharks, especially on the high seas. The United States will intensify efforts to convince other countries to join in prohibiting shark finning, consistent with the goals of H.R. 5461.

I note, however, that two provisions of the bill raise constitutional concerns. Because the Constitution vests the conduct of foreign

affairs with the President, Congress may not dictate the executive branch's negotiations with foreign governments (section 5). Because the Constitution preserves to the President the authority to decide whether and when the executive branch should recommend new legislation, Congress may not require the President or his subordinates to present such recommendations (section 6). I therefore direct executive branch officials to carry out these provisions in a manner that is consistent with the President's constitutional responsibilities.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
December 26, 2000.

NOTE: H.R. 5461, approved December 21, was assigned Public Law No. 106-557.

**Remarks on the Recess Appointment of Roger L. Gregory to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and an Exchange With Reporters**

*December 27, 2000*

**The President.** Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Thirty-nine years ago the great grandson of a slave became the first African-American to serve on the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. In 1961, amidst fierce opposition, President John F. Kennedy appointed Thurgood Marshall as only the second African-American to fill a vacancy on the U.S. Court of Appeals. In doing so, President Kennedy not only ensured that the people of the Second Circuit would be served by an excellent jurist; he also took a big step forward in America's ongoing efforts for equal opportunity in every aspect of our life, including our courts.

Judge Marshall went on to become one of our Nation's most distinguished jurists, highlighted by his 1967 appointment by President Johnson as the first African-American Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

President Kennedy's action was in the grand tradition of Presidents of both parties, dating all the way back to George Washington, who have used their constitutional

authority to bring much needed balance and excellence to our Nation's courts.

Four of the first five African-Americans to ascend to the appellate bench were initially appointed in the same fashion that I employ today. To fill a similar gap in our judicial system, I am honored today to announce my appointment of Roger Gregory, one of Richmond's most respected trial lawyers, to fill an emergency vacancy on the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. I will renominate him when Congress returns in January, and I urge the Senate to confirm him.

I take this extraordinary step for extraordinary reasons. First, the people of the fourth circuit are not receiving the judicial representation they deserve. The U.S. Judicial Conference has declared this seat a judicial emergency. It has been vacant for more than a decade. In the last 5 years alone, fourth circuit caseloads have increased more than 15 percent; yet one-third of its judgeships are vacant. This has left too many citizens waiting in line for justice. It is a travesty in a nation that prides itself in the fair and expeditious rule of law.

Second, it is unconscionable that the fourth circuit, with the largest African-American population of any circuit in our Nation, has never had an African-American appellate judge. As I said when I first nominated Roger Gregory, it is long past time to right that wrong. Justice may be blind, but we all know that diversity in the courts, as in all aspects of society, sharpens our vision and makes us a stronger nation.

Time and again, for 5 years now, I have tried and tried to fill these gaps in justice and equality. And time and again, for 5 years now, the Senate majority has stood in the way.

Third, and perhaps most important, Roger Gregory is the right man at the right time to fulfill this historic role. His life is a testament to the power and promise of the American dream.

The son of factory workers, he's the first in his family to graduate from high school, let alone college and law school. He graduated summa cum laude from Virginia State University and went on to earn his law degree from the University of Michigan Law School.

He returned to teach at Virginia State, where his mother had once worked as a dormitory maid.

He is now one of Virginia's leading litigators and one of its most civic-minded citizens. He's earned high praise from all quarters, including the American Bar Association, religious leaders, and both of Virginia's Senators, Republican Senator John Warner and Democratic Senator Chuck Robb.

I want especially to thank Senator Robb for all he has done to make this day possible, for his tireless leadership in the Senate on this and so many other issues. He worked very hard to get back here today, but the bad weather down in Texas made it impossible. But I do want to thank him. He convinced me, and when I looked into the record I saw that it was absolutely true, that Roger Gregory would make an excellent judge for all the people of the fourth circuit.

In closing, let me say I have not come to this decision lightly. I have always respected the Senate's role in the appointment process. Indeed, I have made far fewer recess appointments than President Reagan did in his 8 years, and I believe that the record on that is perfectly clear. On the other hand, I am compelled by the facts and history to do what I can to remedy an injustice that for too long has plagued the fourth circuit, and that I have tried for too long to remedy in the established way.

As President, it is my constitutional responsibility to see that justice for all is not just what we promise; it's what we practice. That is the principle behind my appointment of this distinguished American today.

Mr. Gregory, congratulations.

[At this point, Judge Gregory made brief remarks.]

**The President.** Thank you.

I'll answer your questions—I can't resist injecting just a little bit of levity here. One of the things you want in a judge is someone who is well-organized and has a good sense of timing. His children are 18, 12, and 6. [Laughter] I think that ought to be evidence in the hearing on his appointment. [Laughter]

### **Middle East Peace Process**

**Q.** Mr. President, has the Mideast peace process been set back by the Palestinian reluctance to accept your proposals for an agreement with Israel? And do you have any indication of whether Thursday's summit is going to go forward?

**The President.** Well, let me say first, this is the first chance I've had to comment on the substance here, so—the parties are engaged in a renewed effort to reach an agreement. Based on the months and months of discussion I've had on these final status issues, we have attempted to narrow the range of outstanding matters in a way that meets the essential needs of both sides.

The whole question now is whether they agree to continue the negotiation on the basis of these ideas. We've got to bring this to a conclusion if we're going to continue. The issues are extremely difficult, but they are closer than they have ever been before. And I hope and pray they will seize this opportunity. And I think that is all I should say at this time. The less I say, the better.

**Q.** Is that right—you haven't heard from them? It sounds like you have not. The Palestinian officials have been saying they cannot accept your proposals.

**The President.** Well, we'll see what happens. Prime Minister Barak has said that he would accept and continue the negotiations if the Palestinians would, and we'll see what happens. There's a lot of things going on now, and will be in the next several days, and I think, as I said, the less I say about them all, the better.

**Q.** Have you received a response, an actual response from the Palestinians yet?

**The President.** I've said all I'm going to say about this today.

### **Shootings in Wakefield, Massachusetts**

**Q.** Mr. President, what were your first thoughts when you saw the news of the shootings up in Massachusetts?

**The President.** Excuse me?

**Q.** The shootings in Massachusetts—I'm wondering what your first thoughts were and what you would say to the Nation in this holiday season with that happening.

**The President.** Well, I feel what I always feel when tragedy befalls Americans. And I

hope that they will remember that this holiday season—interestingly enough in this season is not only the Christian season of Christmas but the great Jewish and Muslim holy days happen to coincide in the same week this year. So I hope that we will remember, amidst our celebration, to pray for all the people involved.

### **Gregory Appointment**

**Q.** Mr. President, do you think the issue of minority judgeships should be brought up in the Ashcroft confirmation hearings? And was this appointment in part aimed at highlighting that issue and could, in fact, those hearings increase Mr. Gregory's chances of a confirmation?

**The President.** Well, I think I should answer the second question clearly. This is unrelated. I have tried for 5 years to put an African-American on the fourth circuit—for 5 years. Now—and for all the reasons that I made in my—stated in my remarks, I think it is most unfortunate that it has not been done, and I just determined to do it. It's just time to do it.

On the other question, that is something that the Senate will have to deal with. I'll be—it's not my appointment, and I won't be President, and I don't think I should say any more about it. The Senate will do what it thinks is proper there.

### **Possible Visit to North Korea**

**Q.** The President of South Korea says he thinks it is unlikely you'll visit North Korea before January 20th. Have you moved any further toward a decision, whether to send an envoy there to see if North Korea is ready to reduce its missile program?

**The President.** We have been in touch with the North Koreans, and I may have some more to say about that. You know I just have a limited number of days here before I leave office, and I'm trying to get as much done as I can, including on that. I may have some more to say in the next few days about it.

### **Pharmaceuticals Legislation**

**Q.** Mr. President, the reimportation of drugs law that you signed and which today you received the letter from Secretary

Shalala—some folks are wondering why you would sign a law that contained such supposed flaws as were identified by the Secretary. Do you have any plan to negate, circumvent, or seek to counteract or overturn her ruling?

**The President.** Well, what she—I said when I signed the law that it was deeply flawed. She is required by law to make a determination that—two things—one, that the reimportation would not weaken the safety standards that we have for Americans and their pharmaceuticals. I think she could do that. But the second was, she had to make a determination by law that this would lower prices for American consumers. And the law was so different from the one we proposed and is so full of loopholes that she could not say in good conscience that she believed that the prices for consumers would go down, which is exactly what I warned when I asked them not to do this.

So what we'd like to see is a law that protects safety that will lower consumer prices. I do think that people ought to be able to do this, and—I did before, but I will again, as soon as the Congress comes back—I'll send them a statement of the things that I believe would meet the standard of the law. I think that Secretary Shalala did what she thought the law required her to do, and since she couldn't certify that American consumers wouldn't get lower prices, she didn't want to hold out false hope and be involved in something she thought was not legitimate.

So I hope we can work this out. I do think there was in the last Congress, and I think there will be in this one, a majority for allowing Americans to reimport drugs under strict safety standards at lower prices. But I think we have to do it in a way where we don't promise something that doesn't materialize. That's all, really, that was at issue here. And I think—we'll send something up in the way of clarifying language as soon as they come back next week and see what we can do.

### **Incoming Bush Administration**

**Q.** Mr. President, the Bush team has said that they're going through all of your Executive orders and your administration's regulations with a fine-tooth comb, and they may undo them. Are you concerned about this,

and do you think that this recess appointment could go the way some of your Executive orders might?

**The President.** Well, they have very different views on the environment, particularly, and on some other issues. And when they take office, you have to expect them to do what they think is right. And you have to expect the people who disagree to disagree. And democracy will work its will, and then the citizens of the country will make their judgments.

All I can do is to do what I think is right. And these things that we've been doing lately are things that we've been working on for years. For example, the—let me just use one example—the medical privacy regulations, which I think are profoundly important, we tried to do that through legislation, and the Congress—to be fair to the Congress—adopted a bill which said, okay, we've got to get this work done by a certain date, but if we can't get it done, then the administration can take action. So when it became obvious that because of all the conflicting interest groups that it wouldn't be possible for them to do that, when the date elapsed, passed, we decided that we would take action, as the Congress had explicitly authorized us to do.

In terms of Secretary Browner's order regarding the trucks and the fuel, diesel fuel—which I think is a very, very important part of our clean air efforts, when asthma is the number one health problem among children in our country today—we've been working on that for years. That's not some sort of eleventh-hour thing. It's just that we didn't—this is when we finished, and so we did it.

And I think we should just do what we think is right, and then when they get in, they'll do what they think is right. That's what democracy is all about. And they'll either—if they want to undo these things, then they'll either be able to do it or they won't, as the process plays itself out. That's the way the system works. And I have no problem with that. They have to do what they think is right, just like we do.

### **Presidential Pardons**

**Q.** Mr. President, are you still considering providing pardons for some of the White-water figures?

**The President.** I expect to do another round of pardons, but I haven't had any meetings or made any decisions about any others yet. I just expect to do some. I have done—I haven't seen the final numbers, but before the last batch at least, I had done fewer than any President in almost 30 years. And part of that, frankly, is the way the system works, something I'm not entirely satisfied with. But I think that it is appropriate for the President to do them where circumstances are appropriate.

I have always thought that Presidents and Governors, when I was a Governor, should be quite conservative on commutations—that is, there needs to be a very specific reason if you reduce someone's sentence or let them out—but more broadminded about pardons because, in so many States in America, pardons are necessary to restore people's rights of citizenship. Particularly if they committed relatively minor offenses, or if some years have elapsed and they've been good citizens and there's no reason to believe they won't be good citizens in the future, I think we ought to give them a chance, having paid the price, to be restored to full citizenship.

And in that sense, I think that the word is almost misused, because it's not like you—you can't erase the fact that someone has been convicted and served his sentence, in the case of those who have. But there are many people, including more people than I get their applications to my desk—many people don't have lawyers; they don't even know to ask for a pardon—but they'd like to vote at election time; they'd like to be full citizens. And they're out there working hard and paying taxes, and they have paid the price.

So I would like to be in a position to do that. A lot of the folks—virtually all of them on the first list I released, 58, I think, were people that are unknown to most Americans. They're not people with money or power or influence. And I wish I could do some more of them—I'm going to try. I'm trying to get it out of the system that exists, that existed before I got here, and I'm doing the best I can.

### **Summation Speeches**

**Q.** You gave wrap-up foreign policy speeches in London and in Nebraska. Do you

have any other speeches, summation speeches planned for other policy areas?

**The President.** I expect I'll do one on domestic policy; I'm trying. We're looking for a venue, and after the first of the year I'll probably do at least one more.

Thank you all very much.

**Q.** What about Gray Davis?

**Q.** Are you going to take reporters on your next househunting trip, Mr. President?

**The President.** [Laughter] I hope I don't have to do any more.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel. Reporters referred to outgoing Senator John Ashcroft, the incoming Bush administration nominee for Attorney General; and Gov. Gray Davis of California. The transcript released by the Office of the Press Secretary also included the remarks of Judge Gregory.

### Statement on the Death of Jason Robards

*December 27, 2000*

Hillary and I were deeply saddened to learn of the death of Jason Robards. An accomplished actor, Mr. Robards was a commanding presence on the big screen and a passionate force on the stage.

Jason Robards' numerous accomplishments represent the esteem in which his colleagues and his fans held him. After winning two Oscars and a Tony award, Hillary and I had the privilege of honoring Jason's long career both in 1997 with a National Medal of Arts and again in 1999 with the Kennedy Center Honors award for his lifetime of contribution to American arts and culture. Mr. Robards was also a hero in his pre-acting days. Surviving the attack on Pearl Harbor, he earned the Navy Cross—the second-highest naval decoration.

Mr. Robards will be missed by all of us who cherished him and his work. Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Lois, and their six children.

### Statement on Signing the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001

*December 27, 2000*

Today I have signed into law H.R. 5630, the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001." I am pleased that the Act no longer contains the badly flawed provision that would have made a felony of unauthorized disclosures of classified information, and that was the basis for my veto of a previous version of this legislation. I thank the Congress for working with me to produce a bill that I can sign.

I appreciate the inclusion of section 308 concerning the applicability of Federal laws implementing international treaties and other international agreements to United States intelligence activities. Section 308 applies only to intelligence activities of the United States and addresses particular concerns regarding the potential application of future United States domestic laws implementing international agreements to otherwise lawful and appropriately authorized intelligence activities. This provision does not in any way address the proper interpretation of preexisting implementing legislation or other United States statutes, nor does it in any way address other United States Government activities.

Title VIII of the Act sets forth requirements governing the declassification and disclosure of Japanese Imperial Army records, as defined by the Act. The executive branch has previously been declassifying United States Government records related to Japanese war crimes under the provisions of the Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act, Public Law 105-246; consequently, I understand that title VIII does not apply to records undergoing declassification pursuant to the Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act.

Finally, I acknowledge the efforts of the Congress to bring about a more capable, secure, and effective Diplomatic Telecommunications System. I am concerned, however, that the proposed changes for the Diplomatic Telecommunications Service Program Office do not yet represent the best methods for improving the management of



this system. As the executive branch implements this legislation, I encourage the Congress to work with the executive branch to consider alternatives for further improvements.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
December 27, 2000.

NOTE: H.R. 5630, approved December 27, was assigned Public Law No. 106-567.

### **Statement on Signing the Omnibus Indian Advancement Act**

*December 27, 2000*

Today I am pleased to sign into law H.R. 5528, the "Omnibus Indian Advancement Act." This Act is the product of lengthy negotiations among the Congress, my Administration, tribal governments and other interested parties. I commend all of the participants in these negotiations for their work in producing a bill that will benefit many Indian communities.

This Act emphasizes my Administration's commitment to self-determination and self-governance of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian people. In particular, the Act establishes an American Indian Education Foundation to encourage and accept private gifts to help further the education of Indian children attending Bureau of Indian Affairs schools in grades K-12; offers increased economic development opportunities for Indian tribes; authorizes new activities to help support and improve tribal governance, including the new Native Nations Institute at the Morris K. Udall Foundation; provides for the settlement of an historic land case in California; restores and re-establishes the Federal and trust relationship to two separate tribal groups; improves housing assistance to and affordable housing for Native Americans and Native Hawaiians; and includes other benefits and authorities for various American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian communities.

Section 1104 of this bill raises a constitutional concern insofar as it could be read to interfere with my constitutional authority to determine when and whether to recommend

legislation to the Congress. I will therefore treat it as precatory.

This Act demonstrates our commitment to providing more support to the aboriginal peoples of this Nation. I am pleased to sign it into law.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
December 27, 2000.

NOTE: H.R. 5528, approved December 27, was assigned Public Law No. 106-568.

### **Statement on Signing the Assistance for International Malaria Control Act**

*December 27, 2000*

Today I am pleased to sign into law S. 2943, the "Assistance for International Malaria Control Act." In doing so, however, I note that section 405(b) of the Act purports to restrict the President's constitutional authority to appoint "Officers of the United States" by requiring that individuals be appointed to the Pacific Charter Commission only "after consultation" with specified members of the Congress and by requiring that not more than four of the appointees "may be affiliated with the same political party." Because the work of the Commission may interfere with the constitutional authority vested in the President to conduct foreign affairs, the restrictions in section 405(b) are constitutionally problematic and I therefore construe these restrictions to be precatory only.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
December 27, 2000.

NOTE: S. 2943, approved December 27, was assigned Public Law No. 106-570.

### **Interview With the New York Times**

*November 30, 2000*

#### **Vietnam and China**

**Q.** Thank you for seeing us. As you probably know, we're preparing to write this fairly lengthy series that looks back over the past

8 years. And we felt we'd start with the Vietnam trip, because it seemed at moments as if this was sort of an effort to put bookmarks on your approach to defining the world these days. When you came into office, there was still a trade embargo on Vietnam. As you leave, you have used every one of your economic and diplomatic levers to draw them out. And we saw the response on the streets.

Looking back now, are you convinced that this approach that you developed of using this web of economic engagement as thoroughly as you can, not only in Vietnam but with China, attempts with North Korea, has actually worked, and that's proved your thesis that as you engage more economically, you actually do bring countries around to democracy—this despite the Vietnam and Chinese examples?

**The President.** Well, the short answer is, yes, I think it is—I think it will work. But I think it's a question of whether you—whether we're prepared to pay the price of time and what the options are. I don't think there's any way for us to bring openness and freedom to China or to Vietnam more quickly than the one we've adopted. I don't think that either country—I don't think we have any levers of pressure, for example, that would bring change more quickly. And I think the downsides of adopting a different approach are greater than the upsides.

I think the—first let me back up and say my whole view of this period in which we're living is that the world is becoming exponentially more interdependent, and with all kinds of new opportunities and all kinds of new dangers—that if you want to make the most of an interdependent world, you have to let people within your country have more freedom over the basic aspects of their lives.

Now, in different ways, the Chinese and the Vietnamese have taken the position that they're going to allow a lot more personal freedom. In China they even have a million village elections now. But they're going to try to keep a one-party state with control of the political apparatus, with the intent at restrictions on political speech and freedom, and regrettably, often religious speech and freedom.

So the question is, how can we respond to the good things about the decisions they've

made, and how can we hasten the day when, from our point of view, they'll give up a lot of the bad things? And it seems to me that this sort of combination of economic and political integration and cooperation, where possible—for example, we cooperated with the Chinese in dealing with a lot of the North Korean issues; we cooperated with the Vietnamese most clearly in the MIA area—and then having a dialog and having fairly frank and open disagreements, where we still have disagreements—which you saw in China with my press conference there and the speech I gave at the university in Vietnam—I think that's the best way to do this.

It depends on whether you think—I don't think freedom is inevitable or the triumph of democracy is inevitable. But I think it is rendered far more likely by the power of our example and the strength of our engagement and having more oneness, having more people in these other countries who come from the United States and from other places where people are freer.

So I think that, from my point of view, that it will be a successful policy. But it has to be pursued, and we have to be patient, and we have to realize that we have limited control over other people's lives.

**Q.** What kind of timeframes are we talking about for China and Vietnam, do you think?

**The President.** I don't know. I think, if you look at Vietnam, it was really interesting to me when I was there to see the differences in the approaches taken sort of in gradations from the mayor of Ho Chi Minh City to the Prime Minister to the President to the General Secretary of the party. And if you—the way they—even the way they talked was so much a function of their responsibilities and the extent to which they are dealing with the emerging world, I was actually, on balance, quite encouraged by what I saw there and where I think it's going.

In China, I think it's really just a matter of time. If you go to—as I've said, you've got a lot of different things going on in China. It's a vast country. But if you go to Shanghai, or just go out in those villages—like I went to a couple of those little villages, where they elected their mayors and all—I think there's more and more personal freedom, freedom of movement, freedom of choice of career,

freedom in educational choices, things that did not exist before. And I think that eventually the country will become more open and free if we do the right things and they do the right things. There is always the possibility you will have people get in office in either country that will make mistakes. But I think that the policy is right, and the direction is right.

**Q.** Mr. President, sort of coming back to Vietnam from a domestic side, were there ways in which you felt your going there and the trip had brought you full circle kind of culturally and politically? Did you think there was any way in which you'd brought a certain kind of closure to your own personal relationship with, obviously, that incredibly tense period in our national life of 30 years ago, or for the country, at a time when, for admittedly very different reasons, the country once again seems to be somewhat politically polarized and divided?

**The President.** Well, it was interesting—I had this encounter with the General Secretary of the party, sitting there with Pete Peterson, who was a POW for 6½ years. And he is, parenthetically, not just our Ambassador but a very good personal friend of mine—we've been close for years—and a man who is astonishingly free of resentment and demons, given what he went through.

But—and some of this has been reported, but basically, the General Secretary was saying—he was the most hard-line of all the people I talked to—and he said, “Well, we can talk all about the future here, but we've got to get the past straight. And we didn't invade your country; you invaded our country, and it was terrible. And I'm so glad that so many of the American people opposed it. I'm glad you opposed it. I'm glad the people were in the streets. But it happened, and we've got to somehow work this out.”

And I looked at him, and I said, “If you want to talk about history, we can, but”—and it's true that we were deeply divided over the war. I said, “Most of our division related to what the character of the conflict was and what if any impact we could have on it.” But I said, “Mr. Chairman, we were not France. We were not colonialists. We were not imperialists. And people like Ambassador Peterson that served 6½ years in one of your pris-

ons, they came here believing they were fighting for freedom and self-determination for the South Vietnamese.”

I said, “Now your country is unified, and you are at peace. But you still have to face the age-old questions: How much of the economy should the state control? How much should be in private hands? How much personal freedom should people have, and how many decisions should be made by their families, their villages, or the state?” And I said, “I think it would be better if we had these discussions looking to the future.” It was a fascinating encounter.

But for me, I think if it was liberating, it was because it sort of—well, let me back up. I asked Pete Peterson a question, because when we came there—and we had the state arrival the next morning, and then we were standing there and they were playing the anthem, and they were playing—all these things were happening. For about 15 minutes, I was just—all I could think about were my four high school classmates who died in Vietnam and my Oxford roommate who committed suicide. That's all I could think about for about 15 minutes. And then finally I was sort of—it came time to be President, and I sort of snapped out of it.

So after this arrival ceremony, I asked Pete, I said, “Pete, how long were you here before you quit thinking about what happened to you before?” He said, “Thank God, only about an hour.” It was very interesting. I said, “What do you mean?” He said, “Well, I couldn't let—I mean, how could I not think about it? And then we had a couple of crises, mini-crises, that I had to be Ambassador to deal with, and I got out of it.” He said it never happened again. He said, “I'm okay now. I just get up every day and go to work, and it's part of my past and part of my life. We're dealing with the future.”

I think that's how I felt. After about 15 or 20 minutes, I was into what was going on. I was grateful that we were where we are with them, and I thought we had the basis to build a new future.

And then the next day, when we went out to the site, with the two—

**Q.** That was quite a day.

**The President.** Yes. It was amazing, wasn't it? Let me tell you one thing that I

took away from all this. Because we've been working on this for 8 years now, and our point person on this, nonmilitary point person, has been Hershel Gober, when he was Deputy Director of Veterans Affairs, and then Director. And he did his tours in Vietnam. He was in two branches of the military service. He has a real feel for where all the veterans are. But one of the things I was talking to him about is that when we started this 8 years ago, and our relationships with the Vietnamese were somewhat more halting, they kind of wondered why we were so obsessed with finding the remains of 2,500 people. Because they had still 300,000 people that they were missing, and they know a lot of them are just blown away in bombs, and they'll probably never find them.

And the feeling was that the Government of Vietnam thought that this was—was this real, or are we just so obsessed with individual people, and why do we care this much about it? But the more we worked on it, and then we started sharing data with them—you know, I took 350,000 pages of material there, and we're going to try to give them another million pages of material before the end of the year—I could never believe that the Vietnamese people felt that way, because it's one of the most family-oriented cultures in the world.

And if you read that wonderful novel by the North Vietnamese soldier, "The Sorrows of War"—you've seen it?—I mean, there's one whole section in there where this guy who was a veteran from the time he was a teenager, at the end of the war, in '75, he is in charge of a unit trying to find information about people who are missing. And so to me, one of the things that I got out of this, it really confirmed my hunch that the Vietnamese people, they care a lot about this, too. They sympathize and respect what we're trying to do. And they're glad we're trying to help them do the same thing, even though their losses were staggering and far greater than ours on any scale of things.

The integrity of the event was amazing. When I looked at all those villagers out there, stomping around in the mud, trying to find pieces of metal to recover the proof that those two young men's daddy was in the ground there—I mean, it was just an over-

whelming emotional experience. But I think the point I want to get to is that I think that this is not a Western or an American obsession. This is something that they feel every bit as deeply as we do, and I think it has kind of helped to bring us together as a people.

And you saw in the streets—of course, 60 percent of the country is under 30, and only 5 percent over 60—they are very much into their lives and their future, and they're ready to get on after it.

### ***Third Way Democratic Politics***

**Q.** Mr. President, there's been a lot written about how you redefined the Democratic Party and turned it in the direction of the Third Way. I guess the question that comes to a lot of people as you leave office is how transferable your vision is, how lasting Third Way Democratic politics will be, and what this recent election really says about that?

**The President.** Well, I won't answer the third question, partly because I don't know the answer.

**Q.** About the election, or what it says about the election?

**The President.** Yes, the whole business about the election. A, I don't know the answer to who won the election, and B, I don't know that. But we'll have lots of time for that. Remember what Jack Kennedy said when he won the Presidency. He said, "Victory has a thousand fathers, and defeat is an orphan." So we'll all have time to sort of dig around over the bones or celebrate the victory, depending on what happens.

But first, let's back up and say what I believe. I never believed—this is an argument I used to have with my friend Reverend Jackson all the time; I don't suppose we've finally resolved it yet—but I never believed there was an inherent conflict between the traditional objectives of progressives and liberals in the Democratic Party and what I thought of as the Third Way or the New Democratic approach.

What I felt was, from my perspective having been a Governor all during the eighties, and looking at Washington, was that the country had become polarized, and the rhetoric of Washington had a paralyzing rather than an empowering effect. Now, we've had

a lot of fights here, since I've been here. A lot of it has been mean and bitter and tough and ugly. But nobody has been paralyzed. We've gotten a lot of stuff done. You know, most of what I said I wanted to do in '92, we've accomplished. And the Republicans got some of their business done, too. We did some things. A lot of things happened here. And so I think that it has changed the politics of America.

I mean, basically—let me back up a second. My whole theory of this new Democratic Third Way is that when you go through a period where the human affairs change, and we're in a period of enormous change in all of human affairs, how we work and live and relate to each other and the rest of the world, you have to find an approach that works, that explains the way the world is and opens up people to take the necessary actions to keep moving forward.

And what I thought when I ran in '92 was that there were—Washington, and the country because of Washington, was paralyzed into all these either/or choices. Either you invest in education, or you reduce the deficit. Either you took care of the poor kids on welfare, or you made their parents go to work. Either you protected the environment, or you grew the economy.

And what happened was, very often nobody could do anything, because they'd just fight, or they'd make decisions that didn't make a lot of sense. So let me just—to go back to basics, when I said in '92 that I thought we ought to organize our Nation around a vision for the 21st century, of opportunity for every responsible citizen, a community of all Americans, and America leading a very different world toward peace and freedom and security, to me, that was really real. And what it meant was, instead of either/or, I tried to find some “both” solutions, some win/win solutions.

And a lot of people criticized me at the time. They said, “Well, he doesn't have a foot in either camp. Therefore, he must not have any convictions.” But that's not where I saw it at all. For example, I didn't think we could have an economic policy that would work unless we both got rid of the deficit and invested more in education and science and technology. I didn't think we could have a

welfare reform policy that worked unless we both required people to work and then rewarded work and helped them with their kids, with the food stamps and the Medicare and all that—Medicaid—because that's the most important work of any society. I didn't think we could in the end sustain an environmental policy if everything we did in the environment hurt the economy.

I thought we had to find a way to clean up the environment and preserve it and improve the economy. I didn't think we could have a crime policy that would work unless we had more police and more prevention. And I thought just the rhetoric of having more punishment was—it sounded good, but it wouldn't lower the crime rate. I didn't think that—in the Government, we reduced the size of Government and increased its activism. I wanted to take on a lot of these diversity issues, race and gender and gay rights. But I thought I had—and I brought in an unprecedented number of people from minority communities into the Government, but I thought if I didn't also have a high standard of excellence that I would fail; that you had to prove that diversity and community and excellence, that they all went hand in hand.

So to me, this whole so-called New Democratic approach was a way of synthesizing our values and our policies in a way that would work. And probably the test of all this is whether it worked or not, and I think that if that's the test, that we pass.

And if you look at the debate in this election, to go back to your election question, if you look at the debate—I remember the first time I heard Governor Bush give his compassionate conservative speech. He was out in Iowa, and everybody was sitting around on bales of hay. And I thought, this is pretty good; this basically says, “Okay, I'm a New Democrat, except I'll do more of it with the private sector than the public sector, and I'll give you a bigger tax cut.”

Now, we obviously felt that the differences were much more profound. But the point is that it shows the extent to which the idea of finding a synthesizing, progressive movement that unifies instead of divides people has captured the public imagination.

**Q.** So you think it will last, or too soon to tell?

**The President.** I think it will last if that's the only way to get stuff done. For example, if you look at the fact that the Congress is now more closely divided even than it was before, and it was pretty closely divided before, I think that if you want to fight, you can fight and have a dead-even split on everything. If you want to do things, I think it will be possible to do quite innovative things in the next 4 years, important things. But in order to do it, you'll have to define a dynamic center, which is what I've tried to do. I've tried to restore a vital, dynamic center to American life.

#### ***President's Policies and Conduct***

**Q.** Mr. President, sort of following up on that, given how over the past couple years virtually every poll has shown a strong generic issue advantage for the Democrats on almost every issue, except this one lingering problem of morality and values—given how hard you had worked, in your first term especially, to make personal responsibility and sort of join personal responsibility with opportunity and community, and how successfully you seemed to be able to do that, do you feel any regret or responsibility that the issues of the last 3 years and impeachment and so forth, that you bear any responsibility for the Democrats having problems in that regard now?

**The President.** Well, I don't know. I think the evidence of that is, to put it charitably, mixed. The big problem there is, that was the way—it was that way when I took office in '92. It was that way in '88. We were making some headway, but, look, a big part of that is—I think it's wrong, by the way. I think it is dead wrong. But a big part of that is that married—especially white, married Protestants, the biggest voting block in America, tend to identify things like the abortion issue, even though people are basically pro-choice, the pro-life crowd tends to get a morality edge there, and the gay rights issue have had a lot to do with that, among a lot of people who measure these things.

And I think the Republicans, frankly, are much more—because they are less likely to want the Government to do anything, that

is, in terms of affirmative social programs, for 30 years, and certainly for 20 years, since President Reagan—have been much more likely to talk in rhetorical terms that are value laden and instructive. And if you just listen to them, the Democrats are much more likely to be talking about, "Here's what we want to do." And they're much more likely to talk about, "Here's what's right and wrong."

And I think that with a certain group of people, our advocacy of gay rights and our pro-choice position has reinforced that. Even when people disagree on the issue, they may give them credit for sort of being more stern and more righteous and more moral and all that.

**Q.** So you think it had more to do with those kinds of policy things than with whatever personal—

**The President.** I know it did. Yes, because otherwise, you have to believe that the American people are guilty of guilt by association, and I don't believe that. I don't believe that voters hold one person responsible for another person's mistake. I mean, that's an insult to the American people. That acts like if you do something—if you write a piece about me that I think is dishonest, I wouldn't condemn the New York Times. [Laughter] I wouldn't say—if you say something about—

**Q.** We get that all the time. [Laughter]

**The President.** No, but if you write something to me that I think is terrible, I say, God, there must be something wrong with Sanger because he worked at the same place. I just don't believe—you know, people are not like that. I don't think that—people are fundamentally fairminded, and whatever their judgments of me are, by the same token, they—two-thirds of them disagreed with the impeachment process, but they didn't, all of a sudden, declare the Republicans immoral for doing it.

See, I think that might be the best illustration of it. I mean, the Republicans—

**Q.** From the other side, then?

**The President.** Yes. So I think if somebody makes a personal error, I don't think it gets transposed onto the whole political scene in any kind of lasting way. I think that if you look at the history of this, I think that the Republicans have really been very, very

good at sort of adopting the family values rhetoric and doing all this, and they stick with it. And I think when we push the envelope as we have on the gay rights issue, or we stand up and fight for the pro-choice, I think they got a lot of benefits out of their partial-birth abortion advocacy, even though I thought it was—the issue was wrongly stated, and I didn't agree with their position, as you know.

I just think that a lot of these things—these are the issues that they hear about. I'll give you another example. There is one other example where they're on a big issue lead. How in the world could they have kept the lead they did on national defense after the record of the last—you know, we reversed the declining defense spending under the cold war. We had a successful conclusion of the conflict in Kosovo, and the Vice President was out there having a 20-year record on all of these issues and actually advocating, at least at the moment, spending more money than his opponent was in the campaign, but they kept the lead in that.

So I think a lot of these things, they build up over a long period of time, and people develop certain takes on them. I'm actually glad we took down their lead in a lot of—you know, they don't have the lead in crime and welfare and balancing the budget and managing the economy and managing foreign policy any more that they used to have, and that's good.

#### ***Fair Treatment in the Press***

**Q.** Just at the risk of creating an impression of unfairness in the New York Times, could I ask you one other kind of corollary that's kind of really a philosophical question? I guess since as long as I've known you and as long as I've known people in your orbit, the thing that seems to be a common thread that all your senior aides have said over time is that your greatest strengths are inexorably, I suppose as all human nature is, bound up in some of your potential weaknesses, and that the same aptitudes and appetites that have made you the most formidable political person of your generation have sometimes got you in trouble.

I just wonder if you think there is any way that, over the last 8 years, somehow America

could have had the best of you without getting the worst of you, or is it all sort of wrapped up in one package?

**The President.** Oh, that's a judgment for somebody else to make.

**Q.** You don't want to take a—

**The President.** Yes. You guys were wrong about Whitewater. I wish we had the—that Gertz piece was ridiculous, absurd on its face. I wish we could have had the great New York Times without that. It was like Wen Ho Lee, chapter one. I wish we could have had it. [Laughter] But we couldn't. So we still got the New York Times. Is the country better off for having the New York Times? Absolutely it is. Are we better off having the New York Times? Of course we are. I'll let—the American people will have to make that judgment.

**Q.** Let me ask you—is it ever a kind of thing that you would like to take a good crack at some day in your own writings or your own thinking about this, some day when there's perspective? Because I sense it's—

**The President.** I might. I might. I've been—nobody has any—most people have no idea about what, personally, I've gone through for the last couple of years—and I might do that. But I did the right thing not to do it—this point, because the people hired me to do a job, and I got up every day and did it.

The price I paid for my personal mistake was, believe it or not, more than anything else, a profound personal price. I'm glad that I saved my family. I'm glad that my life is happy and in good shape, and I'm glad my country is still in good shape. But that whole episode was fundamentally a political move. It was not rooted in any established principles of Constitution, or law, or precedent. And so, you know, I didn't have time to be as personally reflective or harshly judgmental of myself, except for once, as I would otherwise have been inclined to do, because I was finding it too hard to save what we had worked for and the direction the country had taken.

And I just think that one of the things I hope—and I saw it in this election—I noticed that there was much less appetite for the politics of personal destruction in this election than there had been in many others, and I

hope that maybe that's one of the consequences of all that I did, and maybe—I mean, what we all went through, and maybe that will be something that's really good for the country over the long run. Maybe nobody else will ever have to go through this.

### **Modern News Cycle and the Presidency**

**Q.** Can I ask you one other thing about the changing universe you talked about, and—obviously you've been the President who has presided over this enormous flowering of the information age. Usually, you cite that as an incredibly good thing. I happened to see Waldman on Charlie Rose last night who was very thoughtful in talking about the one colossal difference between your predecessors and you was, the world knows your flaws in real time now because of this endless kind of news cycle. Is there any way in which that's been a personal burden for you or an institutional burden for the Presidency that you think is problematic or potentially a challenge for your successors?

**The President.** Well, let me just say, I think one of the challenges that I think that we have is, although—let me back up—the short answer to that question is yes, but it's also a great opportunity. If you live in a world of the 24-hour news cycle, it has to be managed and dealt with. I mean, one of the things that—you have choices in dealing with it. But for example, if you watch in this election coverage the last 2 or 3 weeks, the two sides made very different choices. And you can draw your own conclusions, and we probably won't know until we see how it all comes out, whether the choices they made about how to deal with it had any impact on the outcome or what it was. But there were different choices made.

The trap really is not to forget that while you have to manage and deal with and respond to the 24-hour news cycle, it's still a job. And it's a job with a term—4-year term—or if you get lucky, it's an 8-year term. And it matters what your ideas are going in, whether you have a clear vision of what you want to do, and whether you keep doing the job.

So for us, the challenge was both—and sometimes, we would fall off the tracks either

way for the first year or two—you know, sometimes you ignore the demands of the information-intensive environment which you're in, and even if you're doing the job, nobody knows it, and you could get totally derailed and never get to finish.

**Q.** Because you're not seen as doing it—  
**The President.** Yes, you're not managing it. On the other hand, I think what is more likely to happen, what you're more vulnerable to doing—and this is, I think, what we tried never to have happen, even when we were going through the whole impeachment thing, is you don't wall off enough people who keep doing their job. They say, "What is the mission here? What do we get hired to do? How are we going to do it? Who is going to work on it? And how are you going to keep doing it?" And then you've got all these people that are managing the 24-hour news cycle, and how do you integrate the two so that you don't have a total disconnect?

But I think that is a unique challenge. I might say with all respect, I also think it makes your job harder. I mean, by the time you get around to writing something—this is something that you can do that television can't do. This is important, what we're doing now. You're going back retrospective, evaluating what's—for the future and all that kind of stuff.

But if you think about what it's like—I think about this all the time—by the time the evening news comes on at night, more than half the time, whatever it is they're talking about has already been on CNN five times. Now, we know that not many people have seen it, not in the grand scheme of things, but psychologically it still affects—well, what do you do, what would you do, for example, if you were putting together the evening news at night instead of in your business you are doing? Would you report it in the same way that you would have if CNN had never broken it in the first place? You could, rationally, because not that many people have seen it, but I think it affects what you do.

Okay, then by the time you write about it for the next morning, you know it's already been on CNN 20 times and it's been on the evening news twice. So everybody in America knows this thing, whatever this thing is, has



happened, so how do you write about it? Or, to put it in another—what about another major story you've got that wasn't on the news at all? How does it affect the way you present it and develop it in the context of what you have to put in the paper because of what has happened in the 24-hour news cycle?

So it's not just the politicians, this whole thing is—and I think having all these talk shows and—is it sort of the blurring lines between all the distinct media areas, I think, that's also a problem.

One of the things that I think newspapers are supposed to do is help people think. And one of the things that bothers me about a lot of the talk shows is, it seems to me that they're designed to confirm whatever your prejudice is and actually keep you from thinking.

For example, I think some of these people would be kicked off the shows—for example, suppose Bill Press looked at Mary Matalin one day and said, "You know, I never thought about that; you're really right." [*Laughter*] Well, they would have to get somebody else to represent the Democrats. You see what I mean? [*Laughter*] I mean, God forbid you should listen to what the other person is saying, because you might find some wisdom there. And so, from my point of view, that's exactly what we ought to be trying to avoid.

My whole view of the world is that we're in a new aspect of human affairs. Nobody's got a pointer on the truth. Nobody is totally right, and we need to be doing more listening to each other and trying to find common ground.

The best example of that this year was the work we did, Denny Hastert and I did, in trying to put together this new markets legislation, which I still hope and pray will pass when the Congress comes back. Because the Speaker did a lot of good work on that, and we took a lot of their ideas; they took a lot of ours; we got a good—but this is the milieu in which you operate and in which the next President will operate.

But on the other hand, let me say this: There are vast benefits to it as well. For all of the problems, there are vast benefits. If the President has to make an unpopular decision—Kosovo, the Mexican bailout, what-

ever, you name it—at least a significant percentage of the people who hired you to do this job know what you're doing and why from your perspective. They don't have to get it secondhand.

You may not make the sale—you arrive on the air. You're just being repeated on CNN 20 times or whatever, the way it all works. And then you come and tell the next day, and you analyze it and all, but you may not make the sale, but at least you've got your shot.

#### **Kosovo/Mexico Economic Bailout**

**Q.** In those two examples, did it make a difference in Kosovo and the Mexico bailout? Can you say that those would have been less successful if you had not had this direct approach?

**The President.** I don't know. I don't know, because I think if I had—I can't answer that. I can't answer whether—in the Mexican case, it may not have made any difference, because by the time the election rolled around, it was obvious that what we did worked. In the Kosovo case, it might have been more difficult to get off the starting blocks if I hadn't had access to the American people direct. That would be my guess.

#### **Somalia/Bosnia/Rwanda**

**Q.** Talking about foreign policy for a second, I wonder if I could talk about Somalia and ask you—given your experience in Somalia when Colin Powell was still the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs in 1993, do you think that made you overly hesitant to go into Rwanda and Bosnia? And, given your successful intervention in Kosovo last year, what advice would you give to the new administration in similar situations?

**The President.** First of all, I know you all have a lot of questions, and I'm trying not to give long answers, so I'll try to—

**Q.** You saved us our speech there. [*Laughter*]

**Q.** I'm happy for a long answer. [*Laughter*]

**The President.** But the short answer to your question on Somalia and Rwanda and Bosnia is that I do not believe what happened in Somalia affected Bosnia, and really not Rwanda very much, and let me explain why.

What happened in Somalia was as follows: General Powell came to me one day, very near the end of his term, and says, "Aideed's crowd killed these Pakistani peacekeepers who were there with the Americans. We are the only people in the mission there that have the capacity to arrest Aideed. They want us to approve the Americans who are otherwise there as peacekeepers having some people devoted to try to—his apprehension and arrest." I said, "What are the chances of success?" He said, "I think we've got a 50/50 chance to get him, probably not more than a one in four chance to get him alive," something like that.

But he said, "I think you ought to do it." So I said okay. I asked him if he thought I ought to do it, and he said, "Yes, I do. On the balance, I think you should, because you can't just walk away from the fact that these Pakistanis were murdered."

What happened was, that was the extent to which anybody ever asked me about any of this, that in terms of the operation—we learned a lot from that Somalian thing in terms of what kind of operational control we should have in United Nations missions. I don't think we learned that we should never be involved in U.N. missions and work with other people and all that; I don't believe that. But from my point of view, I thought it was sort of a *sui generis* thing. I didn't believe it meant that we could never go anywhere else.

The problem in Bosnia was trying to develop enough of a consensus with our European allies to get something done. And lamentably, we were making progress and then—but the massacre of Srebrenica basically galvanized our NATO Allies, and they were willing to support a more aggressive approach that we and the British had favored all along.

But I think the important thing for me in Bosnia was that the United States should not be acting unilaterally there. We should be going with our allies, and we should be doing everything we can to move. I wish it hadn't taken 2 years to put together a consensus, but it's worked out pretty well now, given how messed up it was when we started.

In Rwanda, I think the real problem was that we didn't have a ready mechanism with

which to deal with it, which is why after Rwanda, we started working on this Africa crisis response initiative and why we were working on training all these Africans to do—Sierra Leone—we were going to work with them and help them, and I also frankly think that it happened so fast.

As it turns out, in retrospect, maybe we and the British and French could have—four or five others—gone in there with a relatively small number of troops and slowed it down. But if you think about it, all those hundreds of thousands of people who were killed in 100 days and hardly anybody had a gun, and I think that we were not really properly organized to deal with it and respond to it.

I hope and believe now that we are and, were such a thing to happen again, we would be able to play our proper role. I also think the Africans, you've got to give them a lot of credit. They're doing a lot better, too. They wanted to be part of this training for Sierra Leone. Mandela got all those people together to try to head off another Burundi and tribal slaughter, and it might work yet. I went over there to help him, as you know, in Arusha.

So I don't think that Somalia—if you think I made a mistake in either Rwanda or Bosnia, I don't think that Somalia is the reason we did it. Because I always thought that Somali thing was just—had much more to do with the fact that we hadn't worked through the command and control and policymaking issues when we were in a U.N. mission that had one mission and then all of a sudden had a very different one when we had to go try to arrest somebody.

I think whatever the problems in Somalia are, they need to be viewed on their own bottom, and I don't think—at least for me, they weren't some demonic nightmare that kept me out of these other places.

### **Race Relations**

**Q.** Mr. President, a couple of domestic issues, and then I'm going to run to Andrews and meet you in New York. Race relations. It can be said that the state of race relations has never been better. I'm sure you're not going to argue with that. And another observation one can make is that black people,

black politicians supported you, gave you tremendous support in some of your toughest political moments. I want you to try to explain an interesting dynamic, though. Some of your—many of your policies, especially earlier in your Presidency—welfare reform, the abandonment of the fiscal stimulus package, support of the death penalty—were opposed by these traditional civil rights leaders, these minority politicians. How do you reconcile this? What's going on here?

**The President.** Well, first of all, I had a record on civil rights matters and relations with blacks that went back through my whole public life, when I started. I also probably had more extensive personal contacts and friendships before I started—not so much in the Black Caucus and the Congress, but I mean in the country—than any white politician who had run for President in a long time, because it's been such a part of my life; it was so important to me, and because of just fortuitous things. The first AME church was in Little Rock; I hosted all the AME bishops when I was Governor. We had black leaders from all over the country come back when we celebrated the 30th anniversary of Little Rock Central High School. Most of the black churches had their national conventions there at one time or another.

When I ran for President in '92, in Chicago, the county attorney, the man who is now president of the Cook County Board, Congressman Danny Davis, three aldermen, three Democratic ward chairs were all from Arkansas. [*Laughter*] We're all born there, part of the history of the diaspora after the war, you know.

So a lot of this was just personal, and I think that even when some people disagreed with some of my policies, they knew where I was on the big issues of race and civil rights and equal opportunity. I think that's right. And I think that the fact that when we got into welfare reform, they saw that I was going to fight for what I wanted—that I did think there should be mandatory work requirements, but I would not abandon the food stamps and Medicaid requirements for the kids.

## Welfare

**Q.** I'd like to really jump in and ask you about a welfare question because I think it fits perfectly here. What's your biggest worry about the future of the welfare bill? And let me give you a couple of possibilities here. Is it that Congress might someday cut the money, that the States will turn their backs on the very poorest of the poor, that a recession might come along and hurt these folks, or that the time limits will prove damaging?

**The President.** I think the biggest worry—first of all, I think if there is a recession that makes it impossible for people to work, even though they're able-bodied, we have built in a big cushion of money in there. We gave the States the money in a block of money, based on the welfare rolls in February of '94—I believe that's right—which was the highest welfare rolls we'd ever had. So even though the welfare rolls went down, as long as they were putting it back in—so I think there will be an appropriate response.

What I've always worried about is that some of the people who would be hardest to place might be caught up in time limits because they superficially looked like they could work but that the States would not provide enough support to make sure they could get into and stay in the work force.

But the other major criticism of the welfare reform bill I just thought was wrong—and I think a lot of people didn't even know this at the time, meaning a lot of people who were writing about it—which is that, by agreeing to let the States set the benefit level by block-granting that money, I was somehow abandoning a Federal commitment to poor people. But the truth is that since the early seventies, States had been able to set their monthly benefits; they just couldn't go below where they were back then.

So when we started working on welfare reform, the support levels for a family of three—before welfare—varied from a low of under \$200 a month in Mississippi, Texas, and one or two other places to \$665 a month in Vermont. And everybody—so, in other words, they had, in effect, been setting their own benefit levels all that time.

What I was really worried about was the desire of the Republicans in Congress to

block-grant the money going—to stop the food stamps and Medicaid for the kids. But I really felt that if we gave them enough money and they had to put more money into child care and into job training, into transportation, and all that sort of stuff, this thing would work pretty well. And I think it plainly has. But I am worried about the hardest-to-place, when you have a combination of tough times and people who may not care about them.

### **Democratic Party**

**Q.** Mr. President, you're given a lot of credit for recreating the Democratic Party as a viable Presidential party. But your critics say that, on the other hand, when you came into office, there was a Democratic majority in the House, a Democratic majority in the Senate, and a majority of Democrats in the governorships around the country. And, of course, none of those majorities now exist. What happened? How do you explain these two trends?

**The President.** Well, I think—first of all, I don't know what the answer is on the governorships. Sometimes—I remember in the years when—in the Reagan years, there were times when we had, like, nearly 30 Governors, or maybe more, I don't know. We had tons. So I think sometimes it's hard to make hard and fast judgments.

**Q.** —maybe State-by-State anomalies, just things happen?

**The President.** I don't know that. I don't know the answer to that. It may be when you had a Republican Governor, people wanted—and a Republican President, people wanted Democratic Governors more. I don't know. All I'm saying is, I don't know the answer to that.

In the Congress, I think we had a combination of two things. First of all, all the Democrats will tell you that we had a lot of older Democrats who represented districts that had grown more and more Republican over the last 20 years. And when they retired, we were going to have a hard time holding them.

And then I don't think it's complicated; I think I got in and I adopted an economic plan that they characterized as a big tax increase, and the benefits of it weren't yet felt, and people weren't sure whether they were

getting their taxes increased or not then. I adopted a crime bill which the NRA told everybody was going to take their guns away, and people hadn't felt the lower crime rate or seen the community police on their streets, but they heard the fear. And I tried to pass a health care reform and failed. So that when you fail, people can more easily characterize what it was you tried to do, even if what they say you tried to do has no relationship to what you tried to do.

And we almost had the reverse of what happened in '98. What happened—so a lot of our people, our base voters in the '94 election, they were kind of sad that welfare reform didn't pass—I mean, health care didn't pass. They didn't know about—they didn't know how they felt about this economic plan because they maybe didn't feel their lives were better yet. And they didn't perceive that the crime rate had come down yet.

So we were running in the worst of all environments, and I basically have some significant responsibility for that because I jammed a lot of change through the system in a short time. And maybe politically, I made a mistake not doing welfare reform in '94 and trying to put health care off until '95 or '96. And maybe it would have been less. I think we would have lost seats in any case because of the dynamics of who was running and what the seats were and all that. But I think that it was much worse than otherwise it could have been. And it's pretty much what happened to Harry Truman when he tried to do health care reform.

I mean, basically, we sort of repeated the cycle of history. And I just made an error. And I felt terrible about it, and I spent the last 6 years trying to undo it. We picked up several House seats in the '96 election, and then in '98, when we won seats in the House and didn't lose seats in the Senate, is the first time in 122 years that in the sixth year of a Presidency, the President's party picked up seats in the Congress.

And this year we did immensely well in the Senate races, because for the first time in 6 years, for the first time we had a good rotation, and we had good candidates. And because the House was so close, the energy of the Republican right—the public energy of the Republican right shifted from the

House to the Senate the last 2 years. And I think that's one of the reasons that we did better in the Senate.

When Hastert became the Speaker, they tried to present a more moderate image. I mean, there are lots of other things—I haven't had time to analyze all these House races—but we're in the position we're in partly because we were going to lose some seats which had been moving Republican when our senior people retired or got beat, but also because of all the things I did in '93 and '94. And one of the things I feel badly about is, I think that those decisions were good decisions. I think one of the reasons I got reelected in '96 is because the economy was in good shape and we were getting rid of the deficit, and a lot of the people who made the decision to do it paid the price.

The same thing on the crime. We celebrated the anniversary of the Brady bill today. Now over 611,000 people have not been able to get handguns because of the Brady bill handgun checks. But we lost a dozen House Members over it. And there's no point in kidding around about it. They did—I mean, the NRA took them out. And now, of course, all those voters, if they had a chance to vote again wouldn't do that, because now they know, after all, they didn't lose their handguns; they didn't lose their rifles; and they didn't lose their opportunity to go into deer season. But at the time they didn't know that.

So what I tried to do after the '94 elections was not to slow down the pace of change but to figure out how much I could jam through the system in any given time and to make sure that if we were going to do something really controversial, we tried to sell it in advance a little better. Because I don't think there's any question that we lost more seats than we would have if I hadn't done the economic program and the crime bill and the health care in 2 years.

### **Health Care**

**Q.** Is health care your biggest regret?

**The President.** Well, I regret the fact that there are a lot of people in this country who still don't have health insurance. But we finally got the number of people without insurance going down again, for the first time in

a dozen years, because of the Children's Health Insurance Program triggering in. So we're moving on it.

And I suppose on a policy front, that certainly ranks right up there. I wish we'd gotten—I wish we'd been able to do more. But we got the number of uninsured people going down, and now we know how to do it, interestingly enough.

I think in next year, I think the Congress ought to let the parents of the CHIP kids buy into it. I think they ought to let people over 55 buy into Medicare, as I proposed. There's three or four things you could do to dramatically reduce the number of people without health insurance in a piecemeal basis.

But let me say—people say, “Well, why didn't you do that back in '94?” The reason is, we didn't have the money to. If you want to provide health insurance, universal health insurance, there's only two ways to do it. It's not rocket science. You've either got to require the employers to offer the health insurance and then give a little financial—a tax break to the people who have a hard time providing it, or you have to pay for it with tax money. And we had just raised taxes in the economic plan of '93 to get the deficit down. And we didn't have any money, so we couldn't raise taxes, and we didn't have—and the economy was not strong enough for the Congress to feel comfortable putting the employer mandate on it.

So I think—that was my mistake. That wasn't—I've always thought that my wife took too big a hit on that. That was—I asked her to come up with a universal plan that maintained private health providers. And there aren't any other options, and neither option, frankly, in 1994 was politically doable in that Congress, and maybe not in the country by the time the interest groups got through mangling on it. So that was my mistake, and it's one I have to live with—like all my other mistakes. [*Laughter*]

**Q.** Mr. President, we know your ride has arrived, so we'll try to—

**The President.** Yes, I don't get to do this much more, so you don't want to cut me out—[*laughter*].

### ***Economic Globalization and Opposition***

**Q.** But to go back to where we started, you've clearly done more than any President has in history to describe the opportunities to both Americans and foreigners about what globalization, what global markets are going to do for them. Yet, around the globe you hear more anger at America now about its primacy, its economic and its military strength, its cultural strength, than ever before, certainly than when you came in in '93. Was there something that you could have done differently, or something that you would advise your successor to do differently to diffuse this anger?

I'm talking about, in part, the kind of anger you saw at Seattle, not downstairs but upstairs, among the countries that were getting in the way of your agenda.

**The President.** Well, first of all, I think when you are—most people didn't think we were worth resenting in '92. [*Laughter*] They had pity for us. They thought, "How sad it is, America can't pay its bills. They've got this deficit," and all that kind of stuff.

I think a lot of the resentment is due to the success that we've had, and a lot of people feel that we have not done as much probably as we could have to share that success. But a lot of things, like little things like the unwillingness of the Congress to pay our U.N. bills and stuff like that, that grates on people.

But my sense is that most countries, even though they disagree with the United States from time to time, or they don't like what they see as our unilateralism when we disagree with them, still have a lot of respect for this country and still believe that we basically mean well in the world, and that—I think the answer is that we have to keep—there isn't a silver-bullet answer—the answer to this is, we have to keep working along to work with other people to try to find common ground where we can in an increasingly interdependent world. I think that's just the short answer.

Look, on the trade issue, the interesting thing about Seattle was—both in that room, as you pointed out, and in the street, is you had people who acted like they were marching in solidarity who had diametrically opposed positions. I mean, my friends in the

labor movement who were there, they believe that globalization is bad because people in other countries work for a little bit of money and sell into America and knock folks out of jobs that have to have more money to live. But a lot of the people in those developing countries who were marching are mad at America because we, almost alone, among the advanced countries would like to have a global trading system that has minimum labor and environmental standards. And so a lot of them thought that's my indirect way of being a protectionist, in protecting the good jobs in America and keeping them poor.

And I think a lot of this—I don't have a dim, a pessimistic view of this. I think a lot of this was inevitable because of the scope of change and because—frankly, because there are a lot of societies where the last 10 years have been pretty tough. But I think if you take a broader view, if you look over the last 50 years, it's plain that global integration spawns more economic opportunity, creates wealth in wealthy countries, and creates more opportunities in poor countries, if they're well-governed, if they have good social safety nets.

So I think—let me just say, this is a big issue with me and rather than just talk on and on about it—remember, I went to Geneva twice to speak about this; once before to talk about child labor at the ILO, and once at the WTO. I went to Davos to give a speech about this, as well as to Seattle. I think that one of the four or five biggest challenges in the next 20 years will be creating, if you will, a globalized system with a human face. You cannot have a completely global economy without having some sort of global social understandings.

So you're going to have more political interdependence; we're all going to have to be working more together; more concern is going to have to be evident for the poor. One of the things that I'm proudest of about this last year is that we got bipartisan agreement—I give the Republicans credit for working with us—on this big debt relief initiative to help the poorest countries of the world, but only if they take the savings and put it back into education, health care, and development in their own country. This is

a huge thing. And it's part of putting a human face on the global economy.

So I think that my successor and his successor will be struggling with this whole issue of a global capitalist system and how you create the kind of underpinnings to make people believe it can be a more just society. And I think the resentment against the United States is altogether predictable: We seem to be doing well, and they're not.

And I also think, on the foreign policy front, if you have to use power to achieve an objective, and anytime you start shooting people, some unintended consequences will occur, and it's easy for people who don't have that power to resent it, which is why you have to wear it lightly. You have to be careful.

#### **Highlights of the President's Term**

**Q.** We have a couple of really quick—at the risk of sounding like Tim Russert, we have some quick, snappy—as you look back on your Presidency, what was your single best meal? [*Laughter*]

**Q.** Apple would never have forgiven us if we didn't ask.

**The President.** Oh, my God.

**Q.** Does anything come to mind?

**Q.** It could have been that restaurant in Saigon that last night.

**Q.** Well, while you think about that, what was the most outrageous request you ever received from a Member of Congress?

**The President.** Let me say, I loved the Bukhara meal we had in Delhi.

**Q.** Oh, at the hotel there. I ate there with the First Lady.

**The President.** I loved it. I mean, I can't say that was my best meal. I probably liked some—one of the Mexican restaurants in Phoenix, or something. [*Laughter*] But I liked Bukhara.

The most outrageous request I ever got from a Member of Congress?

**Q.** You don't have to name names.

**Q.** Just the request.

**The President.** That's such a good question. [*Laughter*] What I'd like to do, it's such a good question, I'd like to talk to a couple of our guys and let's think of all the crazy things—"Well, if I vote for you, will you have a picture taken with my grandchild, or something?" I mean, it's crazy. But let me think

about it. Because we may be able to come up with something that's really, really good.

**Q.** We'd even take the top three. [*Laughter*]

**The President.** The 10 greatest reasons.

**Q.** Favorite foreign trip?

**The President.** Oh, boy. That's really hard. I loved India. I liked China. The Vietnam thing was—but I suppose Ireland, 1995. I suppose. Just because my mother's family is Irish, and we're—our oldest known homestead is in Roslea, which is right on the border of Northern Ireland and the Republic.

**Q.** —know what day—you lit the Christmas tree at Belfast City Hall, and Van Morrison sang "Have I Told You Lately That I Love You," dedicated from you to the First Lady.

**The President.** Yes. Van Morrison. Were you there?

**Q.** Yes, I was there.

**The President.** What a great day.

**Q.** Froze my tail off, with Anne Edwards' hands on my behind.

**The President.** And the trip to Derry. And Phil Coulter was singing "The Town I Love So Well."

**Q.** What was your best speech?

**The President.** I don't know. I think the speech I gave in Mason Temple in Memphis in '93 was good. It was a good one. I think the speech I gave at the convention this year was pretty good. But I really don't know.

**Q.** Worst speech?

**The President.** Oklahoma City was pretty good, because I was overcome by—I don't know. I don't know that anybody is a good judge of his own or her own speeches. I'm not sure.

And I don't know what my worst speech was. My worst speech, certainly in historical terms, was the nominating speech I gave for Dukakis in '88. [*Laughter*] People are still making jokes about it—although I thought—I got 700 positive letters, and I found out that 90 percent of them heard it on radio. [*Laughter*] Isn't that funny? We actually checked.

**Q.** How about single best campaign event?

**The President.** Oh, wow.

**Q.** Where you really felt connection with everything.

**The President.** When I knew I wasn't going to die in New Hampshire. When I was in Dover, right before the election, and I gave my—I just was talking off the top of my head. Curtis Willkie sent me a tape of this once, the speech I gave, and that was my famous “I'll be with you till the last dog dies” speech. And I walked out there, and I thought, this is not over. We are not dead.

I remember that. But I had so many wonderful campaign events. I remember, we went to Akron in '92—they've got an airplane hangar that holds blimps, the dirigibles. It's like the third-biggest covered building in America. And I got up there and I said, “It doesn't look like there's many people in here.” And John Glenn said, “It's cause it takes a quarter of a million people to fill it. There are over 50,000 people there, and it means you're going to win Ohio.” And that's what—I knew if we won Ohio in '92, we'd win the election. I remember that was a great night.

But I had so many wonderful—I can't remember my single greatest campaign event. But I love that moment in that hot building in Dover, New Hampshire, in '92; I knew at least I wasn't going to die in New Hampshire.

#### **President's Future Plans**

**Q.** You're not going to run for mayor of New York, are you?

**The President.** Not anytime soon.

**Q.** What does that mean? [*Laughter*]

**The President.** It was very flattering. I mean, but, no. I have to work. It costs a lot of money to support a Senator. I've got to go to work here. I've got to get out there and—Hillary supported me all those years; I've got to get out there and do it.

I'm going to try to be—I'm giving a lot of thought and talking to a lot of people about how I can use these years and my experience and my knowledge to have a positive impact. I want to be a good citizen of our country and have a positive impact around the world, but I have to do it in a way that is appropriate

and that does not get underfoot of the next President. The next President needs time, and especially now after all these events, will need time to bond with the American people and get up and going. And so I have to think through—that's what I'm doing now, thinking through exactly what I want to do and what the appropriate way to do it is.

But I think if you look at the example of Jimmy Carter, it's possible to be quite useful to the world when you're not President anymore.

**Q.** You sound so passionate about globalization. Do you think you—and having a human face on it—do you think you might be able to work with that?

**The President.** Absolutely. Absolutely. I believe in that. But there's lots of things to do. I'm very interested in economic empowerment, poverty elimination. The thing that—we're never going to be able to sell this globalization thing unless we prove that ordinary people can benefit from it. That's what we've got to do. Real people that show up for work every day have to benefit.

One of the problems we've got in the Middle East right now, and I'm desperately—we're killing ourselves trying to get it back on track—is that the average Palestinian income is no higher today than it was when we signed the peace accords in September of '93. Now, there are special facts there; I know that. But we've got to prove—if you want democracy to last, and you want free enterprise to last, which I think is important to freedom, it's got to work for ordinary folks. It worked for ordinary people in America; that's what's sustained us here.

The great thing about this economic recovery to me is, I tell everybody, this is what I call positive populism. We made more millionaires and more billionaires, but the highest percentage increase in income in the last recovery was in the lowest 20 percent of the people. And so this is the first recovery in three decades where everybody got better at the same time. And I just think that's so important.



**Q.** And on the Palestinian front, those special facts have kept the peace process from moving forward.

**The President.** Yes.

**Q.** And it's hard to combat that in a month.

**The President.** But I think Barak actually—this deal that he made for new elections, early elections, and the other guys really didn't want to go right now, I think it opens a new avenue. And they are obviously working—they're obviously trying hard, both of them are, to bring this *intifada* under control now, I think.

**Q.** And then you step in.

**Press Secretary Jake Siewert.** We've got to go.

**The President.** I can't tell you—let me just say this: I'm working hard on this. I always have, and I always will.

**Q.** Thank you, sir. You should have been in Tallahassee. It's unbelievable. You just can't believe what's going on there.

**The President.** Well, when this is all over, we'll have a conversation about it. But right now I need to be the President. [*Laughter*]

NOTE: The interview began at 3:30 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. The transcript was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 28. In his remarks, the President referred to Vo Viet Thanh, chairman, People's Committee, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam; President Tran Duc Luong, Prime Minister Phan Van Khai, and General Secretary Le Kha Phieu of Vietnam; civil rights activist Rev. Jesse Jackson; President-elect George W. Bush; Bill Gertz, reporter, Washington Times; former Los Alamos National Laboratory scientist Wen Ho Lee; "Crossfire" cohosts Bill Press and Mary Matalin; former President Nelson Mandela of South Africa; former Senator John Glenn; and Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel. The interview was conducted by reporters David Sanger, Todd Purdum, Marc Lacey, Robin Toner, and Jane Perlezof. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

## **Memorandum on Funding for International Financial Institutions and Other International Organizations and Programs**

*December 27, 2000*

Presidential Determination No. 2000-08

*Memorandum for the Secretary of State*

*Subject:* Determination Pursuant to Section 523 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106-429)

Pursuant to section 523 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106-429), I hereby certify that withholding from international financial institutions and other international organizations and programs funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to that Act is contrary to the national interest.

You are authorized and directed to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 28. An original was not available for verification of the content of this memorandum.

## **Remarks Announcing the Global Food for Education Initiative**

*December 28, 2000*

**The President.** Good morning, everyone; please be seated. First, I want to thank Senator Dole and Senator McGovern for joining me and for their leadership. I thank Senator Dorgan and Senator Leahy for being here; Representatives Hall and McGovern; Catherine Bertini, the Executive Director of the U.N. World Food Programme; Jacques Diouf, Director-General of the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization; Sven Sandstrom, the Acting President of the

World Bank; representatives of nongovernmental organizations; and all those who have worked to make this global feeding initiative a reality.

I also want to especially thank Secretary Summers, Jack Lew, and the White House staff who worked so hard on this in what, in Washington time, is a very short period of time to put this all together. *[Laughter]*

This morning we gather just 3 days after Christmas, the second day of Eid Al-Fitr, a few hours before the last night of Hanukkah, a time sacred to men and women of faith who share a belief in the dignity of every human being, a time to give thanks for the prosperity so many enjoy today, but also a time to remember that much of humanity still lives in astonishing poverty. Nearly half the human race struggles to survive on less than \$2 a day; nearly a billion live in chronic hunger; half the children in the poorest countries are not in school. That is not right, necessary, or sustainable in the 21st century.

The most critical building block any nation needs to reap the benefits of the global era is a healthy population with broad-based literacy. Each additional year spent in school increases wages by 10 to 20 percent in the developing world. Today, however, 120 million children get no schooling at all, 60 percent of them girls. So this year in Dakar, Senegal, 181 nations joined to set a goal of providing basic education to every child in every country by 2015. At the urging of the United States, the G-8 nations later endorsed this goal at our summit in Okinawa.

Experience has shown here at home and around the world that one of the best ways to get parents to send their children to school is a healthy meal. That's why today I'm very pleased that we are announcing the grant recipients who are going to help us put in place our \$300 million pilot program to provide nutritious meals to schoolchildren in developing countries.

The program will provide a free breakfast or a free lunch to some 9 million children in 38 developing nations. It will work closely with some 14 private volunteer organizations, many of whom are represented here, with the U.N. World Food Programme, and with recipient nations and farm groups so we don't disrupt local farm economies. The result will

be increased school enrollment and attendance, especially among girls, and real improvement in these children's nutritional well-being and ability to learn.

We know from experience that this approach works. In Cameroon, for example, efforts led by the World Food Programme and USAID are feeding almost 50,000 school children, helping to increase school enrollment by over 50 percent, and cutting the dropout rate for girls to virtually zero. We also know we can take that kind of success and extend it across Asia, Africa, the Balkans, and beyond, because a little funding goes a very long way, indeed.

Under this pilot program, for example, we will start providing nutritious food to more than 500,000 children in Vietnam. We will start providing high protein bread and milk each day to some 60,000 students in 170 schools in Eritrea. And in Kenya, we will start giving some 1.4 million elementary school children a nutritious meal every single day.

Of course, this initiative by itself is not a solution to the global hunger problem, but it's a downpayment and a beginning. Now it's up to Congress, the United Nations, other developed countries, the NGO's represented here, and the next administration to continue this fight. We're going to need the World Bank to implement its pledge to increase lending for education by 50 percent. Developing countries need to make basic education a real priority. We need to mobilize private sector resources, something we've worked hard to do, by raising awareness of this issue among foundations.

And in addition to the \$300 million for school feeding, we have also fought hard for and won a new \$37 million initiative called School Works, to support basic education in developing countries, and an overall 50 percent increase for all international basic education programs, including the fine education work being now done at USAID. Finally, we secured \$45 million this year for the U.S. funding for the international program to eliminate child labor, a 15-fold increase since 1998.

The fight for better education is only part of the battle we must wage to make the global economy work for everyone. Implementing landmark trade agreements we've

reached with Africa and the Caribbean is a part of it. Leading the worldwide fight against infectious diseases, like HIV and AIDS, is important. Removing the crushing burden of debt from impoverished nations that will, in turn, invest those savings in their people and their future is fundamental. We must also continue to offer more microcredit loans and close the digital divide.

We've worked hard these last few years to put the battle against abject poverty higher on the world's agenda, and America must keep it there. This is not just about our moral obligation to help the needy, although it is great. It's also part of the answer to what kind of world we want our children to inhabit a generation from now; what do we want to avoid?

The world is becoming more and more interdependent, and America needs strong and healthy partners. We need to invest in future markets, and we need to do it in every part of the world. We want to avoid a world that is hopelessly and violently divided between the rich and the poor, a future in which hundreds of millions of people decide that they have no stake in a peaceful and open global society because there's nothing in it for them and their children. If we can prevent that from happening, it will be good for our economy, for our security, and for our souls.

We are greatly honored today to be joined by two leaders who clearly understand this. George McGovern and Bob Dole served their country in war and peace with uncommon courage, candor, and commitment to their principles. Springing from the soil of our Nation's heartland, they have long believed that America has global responsibilities and must therefore have a global vision.

Over 30 years ago, these two leaders strongly supported the creation of the domestic school lunch program. Last May they both advanced the idea of an international school feeding program. Today we're putting that into practice. The country will always be strong as long as we have leaders like them, leaders with their energy and vision, willing to reach across party lines to build a common future.

Following their example, I am convinced we can put together the kind of bipartisan

and international public/private coalition needed to build the global economy in a way that leaves no one behind and, in the process, creates a new century of unprecedented peace and prosperity. It's a great opportunity and a great responsibility.

Now, I'd like to ask Senator McGovern to say a few words.

*[At this point, former Senators George McGovern and Bob Dole made brief remarks.]*

**The President.** Let me make two brief comments. First of all, on the way in here, the young man who was advancing this event pulled out a copy of a picture of me escorting Senator McGovern across an airport tarmac in 1972. And Senator Dole saw it, and he knew immediately that if he had had that picture in 1996, the outcome of the entire election would have been changed. *[Laughter]* My hair was rather long, and my sideburns look like Burnside; I look like one of those Civil War generals. *[Laughter]* But we were able to cover it up, thank goodness. *[Laughter]*

Let me make a serious point, if I might. First of all, I feel very indebted to all the people who are here. Senator Leahy and Senator Dorgan have long been advocates of fighting hunger. Congressman McGovern came to me with Senator McGovern—no relation, I might add—with this and worded me to death on it. *[Laughter]* And my good friend Tony Hall has been the foremost advocate of dealing with the problems of the poor and the hungry in the world in Congress, and all of us acknowledge that.

But let me just sort of say one thing we did not explicitly say, that I think we should say before we leave. I was talking to Senator McGovern about it. What we would like, as Senator McGovern and Senator Dole said, is to prove through this pilot program that, A, we can make this work and, B, we can do it without disrupting local farm economies. If we can do that, then the goal is to provide this sort of meal at breakfast or lunch, depending on which works better in each country, to every child in the world that needs it. And I think Senator Dole said that we reckon about 300 million. The estimate is it would cost between \$6 and \$7 billion

to do that. So if we were to go that route and the United States were to pay its fair share, it would be about \$1.5 billion, give or take, over the next few years, a year.

But if you think about that, if you think about being able to give a meal to 300 million kids a year every single day of the year for an aggregate international cost of somewhere between \$6 and \$7 billion a year, and you think about all the hundreds of billions—indeed, the trillions of dollars that are spent by governments around the world, I mean, it's just walking-around money; it's such a tiny amount of money compared to the aggregate expenditures of the governments of the world on everything else they spend money on.

I wanted just to do this; we've worked very hard this year to get this off. I'm not trying to saddle the future administration or a future Congress with an unbelievable burden. This is a relatively small new commitment that I think the United States should embrace in cooperation with its allies and friends and others around the world, and one that I hope and pray will be embraced, and it can be funded in any number of creative ways. But I just wanted to say that I believe, 10 years from now, this will have been done. And I believe when that happens, we will be profoundly indebted to these people who have come here today to advance this idea.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:35 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House.

## Remarks on the Budget and an Exchange With Reporters

December 28, 2000

**The President.** Good afternoon. I wanted to take this opportunity to say a few words about our latest budget projections and what they say about the continuing strength of the American economy.

We began 8 years ago to put our fiscal house in order at a time when the Federal deficit was \$290 billion and rising and the national debt had quadrupled in the previous 12 years. Interest rates were high, growth was low, and the confidence of the American people was shaken.

Our new strategy of fiscal discipline, investing in our people, and expanding trade has helped to bring us the longest economic expansion in history. That has given us the chance, along with continued fiscal discipline to balance the budget, to turn decades of deficits into the biggest back-to-back surpluses in history.

Over the past 3 years, we have paid down our national debt by \$360 billion. Today we received more good news. Our updated projections show that in this fiscal year alone we expect to pay down the debt by an unprecedented \$237 billion, meaning that over the course of just 4 years, we will have paid down the debt by \$600 billion.

When I took office, our Nation's debt was projected to be \$6.4 trillion this year. At the end of this year, it will instead be \$3.2 trillion, one half of what it was projected to be. It will be 31 percent of our annual gross national product. In 1993 it was 50 percent of our gross national product.

In interest rates savings alone, there will be in one year—this year—\$166 billion. We are spending—this year we will spend \$166 billion less in interest on the debt than we were projected to be spending 8 years ago.

There is more good news in these numbers. Let's start with what the budget experts called the baseline. That's a budget that just increases with inflation and no new initiatives. The new projections show that if we took that budget and committed the entire surplus to reducing the debt, we could make America debt-free by 2009.

Of course, no one is suggesting that any administration and Congress will go that long with no new initiatives. I have often said that I believe we should use a portion of the surplus to make critical investments in education, provide a prescription drug benefit through Medicare to our seniors, and have a targeted tax cut.

If the incoming administration and the new Congress make such decisions, they could still get us out of debt early. And I want to emphasize, obviously, it is for the incoming administration and the new Congress to decide exactly which projects to address and in what manner. But these new projections mean that a fiscally responsible approach that includes new investments

similar to the ones I described would still permit us to make America debt-free by the end of the decade—in other words, 2 years earlier than the last time we met.

Therefore, even though I told you I would never draw on another one of these charts—[laughter]—because there is more good news, I'm going to do it. But this is the last time I will do it—[laughter]—this year. It means we can get out of debt by 2010. Now, that is a future that all Americans can look forward to. And we don't wait to reap the benefits of this sort of debt reduction. By paying down the debt, we have already helped to keep interest rates down.

This is an amazing thing. Secretary Summers told me this before I came out here: After 8 years of very strong economic growth, long-term interest rates are about 2 percent lower than they were when I took office. That's meant lower mortgage payments, lower car payments, lower student loans, lower business loans. It has freed up more capital for private sector investment. We aren't borrowing the money that people thought we would be borrowing in the Government, and that means there is more money for others to borrow at lower cost.

If we stay up on the path that got us here, by 2010 we will free up 12 cents of every dollar the American people pay in taxes that can go back to them in tax relief or can go into investment in our common future. And that is a profoundly important thing. Just think of it, in 9 years, 12 percent of the Federal budget now committed to interest on the debt could be gone, and that money then would be free for tax relief or for investment in our future.

I think, as I have said many times, that as these interest rates go down, some of this money ought to be dedicated to Social Security, because no matter what path you take for preparing for the retirement of the baby boom generation, any of the proposed scenarios have a significant associated costs. And one of the ways to do this and a way that is painless to the American people is to take advantage of the fact that you're not going to be making interest payments that previously would have been made.

This shows the long-term consequences of a long-term responsible budget policy. There

are huge economic benefits. And if we continue, then we can honestly say, for the first time since Andrew Jackson was President in 1835, the children of America will face the future unburdened by the mistakes of the past. That is something that I believe we ought to do. The American people have earned an unprecedented opportunity to build that kind of America for our children, and I hope we will do it.

Thank you very much.

### **Middle East Peace Process**

**Q.** Mr. President, since last we asked you about the Middle East yesterday, there have been a number of developments. There have been bombings in Tel Aviv, an ambush. Prime Minister Barak did not go to that summit meeting in Egypt. What does that make you think about the prospects for nailing down a final agreement while you're still in office?

**The President.** Well, first of all, I condemn the violence. And I believe it is the violence and the bus that prevented the Prime Minister from going to Egypt; I don't think it is a lack of desire to pursue the peace process. Chairman Arafat is consulting with President Mubarak and, I believe, wants to talk to some of the other Arab leaders.

The important thing to note is that Israel has said—I put some ideas on the table. They go beyond where we were at Camp David; they meet the fundamental needs that both sides expressed at Camp David. And the Israelis said that they would agree to try to close the remaining gaps within the parameters of the ideas I put forward if the Palestinians will agree. And I think that this latest violence only reminds people of what the alternative to peace is.

Look, I expect there to be more in the next few days, as long as we're moving toward peace. There are a lot of enemies of peace in the Middle East, and there are a of people that have acquired almost an interest in the preservation of the status quo and the agony of the Israelis and the abject misery of most of the Palestinian population.

So I expect that we will have to continue to combat violence. But if we can get a peace which meets the fundamental longstanding desires of both parties and we start to have

common efforts in security that go even beyond what we've had for the last few years and we start to have common efforts to build an economic future that benefits everyone, we will have more political and economic stability and we'll have a different future. But in the meanwhile, this thing has been going on a long time, and a lot of people don't want to give it up. And so they're going to try to disrupt it.

But if you just look at the last few months, it's the best argument for going ahead and finishing this. It's not going to get any easier. So this is by far the closest we have ever been. We are much closer than we were at Camp David, but there are still differences, and we're just waiting. If the—the Israelis have said they will meet on these conditions within the parameters that I laid out; if the Palestinians will, and the Palestinians are negotiating—or talking—excuse me—with the other Arabs, and we'll just see what happens.

#### **Decision Not To Visit North Korea**

**Q.** Mr. President, did the President-elect have any influence on your decision not to go to North Korea?

**The President.** No. He said—actually, we had a very, very good talk about it, and he did not discourage it at all. And it would not be fair to put that on him. Let me just say, I briefed him on what I was doing. I told him that Sandy Berger and Secretary Albright had talked to General Powell and Condi Rice about it, and I explained what we were trying to do. But I also told him that I wouldn't take the trip unless I thought that I had time to organize it and devote the time to it to make it right, because I was convinced that because of the leadership of President Kim in South Korea, and because of the very good talks that we have had with the North Koreans and the success we've had now for 6 years on the nuclear issue, that further progress could be made and that it might just have to be something that was done when he became President.

And that is the conclusion I made. We've made a lot of progress with the North Koreans. On what we're discussing now, on the missile issues, we've made a lot of progress. But I concluded that I did not have sufficient time to put the trip together and to execute

the trip in an appropriate manner in the days remaining.

**Q.** Were they willing to go for a halt in the missile—

**The President.** I think that's all I should say. We made a lot of progress with them, and I believe that the next administration will be able to consummate this agreement. I expect visits back and forth. I think a lot of things will happen, and I think it will make the world a much safer place. I feel very good about what we've done. I simply concluded that in the days I have remaining, I didn't have the time to put the trip together in the proper way and to execute it in the proper way. And so that's why I decided not to go.

But you should not infer from that that I'm concerned about it. Indeed, I'm very pleased with the progress that has been made, and I expect the next administration to build on it. And I think they'll be pleased, too, when they look at the facts.

#### **Budget and Incoming Bush Administration**

**Q.** Mr. President, in your remarks on the budget, you almost seem to be addressing an audience beyond this room, beyond most people on television. You seem to be addressing your remarks to the next administration. Do you think—what impact do you think a tax cut of the proportions that George W. Bush campaigned on would have on the course of the arrow on your chart?

**The President.** Well, first, I don't think it's appropriate for me to comment on the specific decisions they will have to make—and the Congress will make. But you can't see any of this in isolation. You have to say—the real issue on the fiscal side is, what is the revenue estimate; are you being conservative? We always were, and even these reflect, by the way, pretty conservative estimates—because you can always have a bad couple of years, and it throws everything off.

And then it's not just a question of a tax cut; you have to ask yourself, in all these things—when you all are doing the math in your head, you have to do the tax cuts plus whatever extra spending there will be plus whatever you do on Social Security. And it's the aggregate amount of money here; it's not just a question of the tax cut.

So I don't really think I can comment, nor do I think I should comment on the specifics. I'm more interested in the big picture, the arithmetic issues. But I'm just saying that I believe that as long as we can do so, we should be shooting for a debt-free America by the end of the decade, because I think that that will strengthen our country enormously.

### **Clinton Family Income and Future Residences**

**Q.** Mr. President, what can you tell us about the Clinton family debt picture? Is there a new house in your future here in Washington, DC?

**The President.** Well, I hope so. Hillary has got to have someplace to live. But we don't have—we haven't closed a deal yet. When we do, we'll let you know. She needs an address, and I'd like to have someplace to come see her. [Laughter]

**Q.** Will you be able to afford all that, Mr. President?

**The President.** Well, I hope so. I'm going to go out and go to work. And——

**Q.** Where? [Laughter]

**The President.** I expect to make a living, and I'll get out of your hair and get out of the media spotlight and go back to making a living. And I expect to—I'll do a—well, I'll write a book and do a few other things. But I think——

**Q.** For \$8 million? [Laughter]

**The President.** I think I'll be able to support her. I don't know. I don't have two best-sellers to my credit like she does, so I don't know.

### **Middle East Peace Process**

**Q.** Mr. President, back on the Middle East. Two elements seem different now than were present at Camp David. First of all, the outlines of peace proposal are open, and you want to take a look at them. And second, there seems to be much more of an effort to involve Arab leaders as the negotiations move forward. Those two things were not present at Camp David, yet the Palestinians still are holding back. What do you think is holding them back, and what do you think would push them across the line and move this forward?

**The President.** Well, I think the—first of all, I think that while we have talked to all of the Arab leaders, I'm not sure that Mr. Arafat has gotten to talk to enough of them. I think that he believes that—he has always believed, I thought, that he was representing not only his people but the larger Arab world, and in some ways the larger Muslim world, in the Jerusalem issues. So I think that he's trying to work through that.

But I don't think, as I've said repeatedly over the last several years, I think when you're in a period like this—that is, where we're sort of—the thing is in gestation, and it's either going to go forward or it's not—I think that the less I say about it, the better.

### **Decision Not To Impose Sanctions on Japanese Whaling**

**Q.** Is your decision not to impose sanctions on Japan for their whaling program a reflection of the fact that you view your friendship with Japan more important than the environment? And as a followup, how do you expect a Bush administration to go through with Japan-U.S. trade relations?

**The President.** Well, the first thing is, the answer to the first question is no. We're working this whaling issue. We have serious disagreements with them about it, and we have some options that we're pursuing. But is our security relationship with Japan important? Of course it is. Is our larger economic relationship important? Of course it is. Is this whaling issue a big deal? I think it is.

So I'm trying to leave this situation in the best possible light for my successor to look at all available options and go forward. That's what I'm trying to do.

**Q.** How can you impose sanctions when the deadline has already passed?

**The President.** Well, there are lots of other things that can be done on this, though, in the future, and I did what I thought was right, given all the factors involved. But I still think this whaling issue is an important issue, and I think that—I understand the role it has in Japanese culture and the political impact of the interests that are involved in it. But I think they are going to have to modify their practices.

**Q.** Are you going to sign the World Criminal Court Treaty?

**The President.** I haven't decided that. I have a couple of days, and I'm getting a last paper on it, and then I'm going to discuss it with our people.

#### **Middle East Peace Process**

**Q.** Back to the Middle East. Have you given the Palestinians any sort of deadline to give you an answer, or are they going to be given an unlimited amount of time to decide? And also, do you expect them to come here? Do you need to talk to them again before you can see if they are making headway?

**The President.** Well, first of all, I think it is obvious we are all operating under a deadline. We're all operating under a deadline; it's just some of us know what our deadline is.

What I have said to them is, there is no point in our talking further unless both sides agree to accept the parameters that I've laid out—not because I am trying to dictate this, but because I have listened to them for months and months and months—indeed for 8 years—and this is the most difficult of all the issues I've dealt with. If there is a peace agreement here, I'm convinced it's within the four corners I laid out.

And then there are still—they both have legitimately a lot of questions, and they ought to ask those questions and get answers to them. But there is no point in even doing that unless we've got a basic framework so we can close. The time has come to close here. And the last several months have shown us this is not going to get any easier, and prolonging it is only going to make it worse. So I'm doing my best to facilitate what I think is what they want, which is to try to resolve this.

**Q.** Do you really think you can resolve it in the remaining—are you really optimistic that you can resolve it in the remaining 3 weeks? And, if you cannot, would you keep at it after you leave office?

**The President.** Well, the answer to your first question is, I think that if it can be resolved at all, it can be resolved in the next 3 weeks. I don't think the circumstances are going to get better. I think, in all probability, they'll get more difficult.

In terms of what I do when I leave office in the way of official work like that, that will

be up to the next administration and any parties there or anywhere else in the world. That would not be for me to say.

One of the things I am determined to do when I leave—I'm going to work until the last day, because I'm drawing a paycheck, and I'm going to work to the last day. After that, I'm going to observe strictly what I think is the proper role of a former President. And we will have a new President, and he has to make the calls, and I will support that entirely. Around the world, I think that's very, very important. So anything I might ever do, indeed, for the whole rest of my life, not just in the first few years I'm out of office, will be determined by what whoever happens to be the President does or doesn't want me to do, and whatever parties in other parts of the world do or don't want me to do. That's just the only appropriate thing, and I will rigorously adhere to that.

**Q.** Have both sides asked you to, sir? Have both sides asked you to keep at it?

**The President.** No, I didn't say that. It depends upon—I think that it is—first of all, in this context, I believe that is exceedingly unlikely. That is, I honestly believe, given the pendency of the Israeli election and the developments within the Palestinian community and the larger Arab world, that the best chance they have to make an agreement is in the next 3 weeks.

Now, none of us who long for peace in the Middle East would ever give up on it. But I think that is both a theoretical question and an unlikely one, because if you look at where the forces are today, they have a better chance to do it now, if they're ever going to do it. It's just—it's really hard. If it weren't hard, they would have done it before this. I mean, they signed the Oslo agreement in '93 and put all this stuff off to the end because they knew it was hard, and it's still hard.

But if you look at where we've been the last few months, it's not going to get any easier. And I just hope that—I've said this before, I said it earlier—we had a confluence of Christmas, Hanukkah, and the end of Ramadan and the beginning of the Eid, and maybe there's something in the stars that will give them the divine strength and inspiration to do it. I don't think it's going to get easier.



**Q.** Well, are your terms negotiable, or are they just parameters?

**The President.** No, they're the parameters. The negotiations, in other words, have to occur within them.

**Q.** So East Jerusalem could be negotiated more?

**The President.** No. I do not want to talk more about this. They understand exactly what I mean. Both sides know exactly what I mean, and they know exactly what they still have to do, and that's enough right now.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:37 p.m. in the James S. Brady Press Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Prime Minister Ehud Barak of Israel; Chairman Yasser Arafat of the Palestinian Authority; President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt; President Kim Dae-jung of South Korea; President-elect George W. Bush; and Gen. Colin Powell, USA (Ret.), and Condoleezza Rice, incoming Bush administration nominees for Secretary of State and National Security Adviser, respectively. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

### **Statement on Census 2000**

*December 28, 2000*

Today I am pleased to receive from the Department of Commerce the first data released from Census 2000, our country's 22d decennial census. I congratulate Secretary Norman Mineta, Secretary William Daley, and Census Bureau Director Kenneth Prewitt for their leadership in Census 2000, the longest continuous scientific effort in American democracy. Since 1790, these data collected during each decennial census help to tell the ongoing story of America, its rich heritage and broad diversity. Most importantly, I want to thank the American people for their participation in Census 2000. With their help, the country is better equipped to meet the needs of every American and the challenges in the 21st century.

### **Statement on Efforts To Improve Relations With North Korea**

*December 28, 2000*

For several years, we have been working with our east Asian allies to improve relations with North Korea in a way that strengthens peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula. We have made substantial progress, including the 1994 Agreed Framework, which froze North Korea's production of plutonium for nuclear weapons under ongoing international inspections, and the 1999 moratorium on long-range missile tests. I believe new opportunities are opening for progress toward greater stability and peace on the Korean Peninsula. However, I have determined that there is not enough time while I am President to prepare the way for an agreement with North Korea that advances our national interest and provides the basis for a trip by me to Pyongyang. Let me emphasize that I believe this process of engagement with North Korea, in coordination with South Korea and Japan, holds great promise and that the United States should continue to build on the progress we have made.

Our policy toward North Korea has been based on a strong framework developed at my request by former Secretary of Defense William Perry and carried out by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright and Special Adviser Wendy Sherman. We have coordinated each step forward with our allies the Republic of Korea and Japan. The engagement policy of President Kim Dae-jung and his personal leadership have spurred this process and earned the world's admiration. Taken together, our efforts have reduced tensions on the Korean Peninsula, improved prospects for enduring peace and stability in the region, and opened an opportunity to substantially reduce, if not eliminate, the threat posed by North Korean missile development and exports.

This past October, when DPRK Chairman Kim Chong-il invited me to visit his country, and later when Secretary Albright traveled to Pyongyang, Chairman Kim put forward a

serious proposal concerning his missile program. Since then, we have discussed with North Korea proposals to eliminate its missile export program as well as to halt further missile development. While there is insufficient time for me to complete the work at hand, there is sufficient promise to continue this effort. The United States has a clear national interest in seeing it through.

### **Executive Order 13184—Revocation of Executive Order 12834**

*December 28, 2000*

By the authority vested in me as President of the United States by the Constitution and laws of the United States of America, including section 301 of title 3, United States Code, and sections 3301 and 7301 of title 5, United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Executive Order 12834 of January 20, 1993, "Ethics Commitments by Executive Branch Appointees," is hereby revoked, effective at noon January 20, 2001. Employees and former employees subject to the commitments in Executive Order 12834 will not be subject to those commitments after the effective date of this order.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
December 28, 2000.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 8:45 a.m., January 2, 2001]

NOTE: This Executive order will be published in the *Federal Register* on January 3, 2001.

### **Statement on Signing the National Moment of Remembrance Act**

*December 28, 2000*

Today I am pleased to sign S. 3181, the "National Moment of Remembrance Act," which designates 3:00 p.m. local time on Memorial Day each year as the National Moment of Remembrance, in honor of the men and women of the United States who died in the pursuit of freedom and peace. The Act also establishes a White House Commission on the National Moment of Remem-

brance, to coordinate and encourage commemorative events on Memorial Day each year, and a Remembrance Alliance, to assist the Commission in promoting the observance of the Memorial Day holiday and organizing an annual White House Conference on the National Moment of Remembrance.

Each Memorial Day, the Nation honors those Americans who died while defending our Nation and its values. While these heroes should be honored every day for their profound contribution to securing our Nation's freedom, they and their families should be especially honored on Memorial Day. The observance of a National Moment of Remembrance is a simple and unifying way to commemorate our history and honor the struggle to protect our freedoms.

This Act recognizes in law a commemoration begun on Memorial Day in May 1997, when "Taps" was played at 3:00 p.m. on many radio and television stations across the Nation as Americans paused to remember the men and women who have lost their lives in service to our country. This past May, both a Congressional Resolution and a Presidential Proclamation called for the observance of a National Moment of Remembrance. It is my hope that the establishment of the National Moment of Remembrance in law, along with the creation of the White House Commission, will promote greater understanding of the meaning of the Memorial Day holiday for all Americans.

In signing this Act, I note that the Appointments Clause of the Constitution requires that all Federal officers exercising executive authority be appointed in conformity with that Clause. Because the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution—who would be a member of the Commission—is not so appointed, he may not exercise significant governmental authority on the Commission but may directly participate in the ceremonial or advisory functions of the Commission. Moreover, because the members of the Remembrance Alliance are not appointed in conformity with the Appointments Clause, they must remain under the supervision of the

Commission, and I interpret the Act to establish such a relationship between the two bodies.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
December 28, 2000.

NOTE: S. 3181, approved December 28, was assigned Public Law No. 106–579. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 29.

**Executive Order 13185—To  
Strengthen the Federal  
Government-University Research  
Partnership**

*December 28, 2000*

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, and in order to keep the Federal Government-University research partnership strong, it is hereby ordered as follows:

**Section 1. Principles of the Government-University Partnership.** The partnership in science and technology that has evolved between the Federal Government and American universities has yielded benefits that are vital to each. It continues to prove exceptionally productive, successfully promoting the discovery of knowledge, stimulating technological innovation, improving the quality of life, educating and training the next generation of scientists and engineers, and contributing to America's economic prosperity and national security. In order to reaffirm and strengthen this partnership, this order sets forth the following guiding and operating principles that are fully described in the April 1999 National Science and Technology Council report, "Renewing the Government-University Partnership." These principles shall provide the framework for the development and analysis of all future Federal policies, rules, and regulations for the Federal Government-University research partnership.

(a) The guiding principles that shall govern interactions between the Federal Government and universities that perform research are:

- (1) Research is an investment in the future;
  - (2) The integration of research and education is vital;
  - (3) Excellence is promoted when investments are guided by merit review; and
  - (4) Research must be conducted with integrity.
- (b) The operating principles that shall assist agencies, universities, individual researchers, and auditing and regulatory bodies in implementing the guiding principles are:
- (1) Agency cost-sharing policies and practices must be transparent;
  - (2) Partners should respect the merit review process;
  - (3) Agencies and universities should manage research in a cost-efficient manner;
  - (4) Accountability and accounting are not the same;
  - (5) The benefits of simplicity in policies and practices should be weighed against the costs;
  - (6) Change should be justified by need and the process made transparent.
- (c) Each executive branch department or agency that supports research at universities shall regularly review its existing policies and procedures to ensure that they meet the spirit and intent of the guiding and operating principles stated above.

**Sec. 2. Office of Science and Technology (OSTP) Review of the Government-University Research Partnership.** (a) The OSTP, in conjunction with the National Science and Technology Council, shall conduct a regular review of the Government-University research partnership and prepare a report on the status of the partnership. The OSTP should receive input from all departments or agencies that have a major impact on the Government-University partnership through their support of research and education, policy making, regulatory activities, and research administration. In addition, OSTP may seek the input of the National Science Board and the President's Committee of Advisors for Science and Technology, as well as other stakeholders, such as State and local governments, industry, the National Academy of

Sciences, and the Federal Demonstration Partnership.

(b) The purpose of the review and the report is to determine the overall health of the Government-University research partnership, being mindful of the guiding and operating principles stated above. The report should include recommendations on how to improve the Government-University partnership.

(c) The Director of OSTP shall deliver the report to the President.

**Sec. 3. Judicial Review.** This order does not create any enforceable rights against the United States, its agencies, its officers, or any person.

**William J. Clinton**

The White House,  
December 28, 2000.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 12:32 p.m., January 2, 2001]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 29, and it will be published in the *Federal Register* on January 3.

### **Letter to Congressional Leaders on Japanese Whaling Practices**

*December 29, 2000*

*Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)*

On September 13, 2000, the Secretary of Commerce certified that Japan had authorized its nationals to conduct research whaling activities that diminish the effectiveness of the International Whaling Convention (IWC) conservation program. This message constitutes my report to the Congress pursuant to section 8 of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967, 22 U.S.C. 1978 (the Pelly Amendment).

Secretary Mineta's certification was the third against Japan for scientific research whaling. The first was in 1988, when Japan initiated its Antarctic program that now entails an annual take of 440 minke whales. The second was in 1995, after Japan extended its program to the North Pacific, where it has been taking 100 minke whales per year. This year, despite a specific resolution passed by the majority of IWC parties calling on Japan

to refrain from conducting lethal research in the North Pacific, Japan expanded its program in the North Pacific to permit the take of 10 sperm whales and 50 Bryde's whales. The total harvest in this summer's hunt was 40 minke whales, 5 sperm whales, and 43 Bryde's whales. I remain very concerned about Japan's decision to expand its research whaling to two additional species.

I also remain concerned about Japan's practice of taking whales in the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary north of Antarctica. This is an internationally recognized sanctuary that was approved by the IWC. I see no justification for Japan's practice and will continue to urge Japan to reconsider its policy, which I believe undermines the effectiveness of whale sanctuaries everywhere. I note in addition that Japan's practice is clearly out of step with the growing international consensus in support of whale sanctuaries, and in sharp contrast to the strong leadership that Mexico and Brazil have both shown in the last 3 months in designating areas off their coasts as whale sanctuaries.

Along with many other members of the IWC, the United States believes the Japanese research whaling program has dubious scientific validity. Information relevant to management of whale stocks can be collected by nonlethal techniques. Products of the research harvest are sold in Japanese markets, which raises questions about the true motivation for the program. In addition, Japan has conducted the same set of scientific research experiments on significant numbers of minke whales for more than 10 years.

I want to underscore that concerns about Japan's lethal scientific whaling program are not simply a bilateral matter. A substantial majority of IWC members share our concern and want Japan to curtail its program.

My Administration has already taken a wide range of economic and diplomatic measures in response to Japan's expanded program. On September 13, I directed the Secretary of State to make Japan ineligible to conduct fishing operations within the United States exclusive economic zone. I, members of my Cabinet, and other United States officials, have raised our strong concerns at the highest levels of the Japanese Government and will continue to do so. I

have personally intervened with Prime Minister Mori. We also joined 14 other governments in making a high-level demarche to the Japanese Government to protest its decision to issue the permits. In September, we canceled a bilateral fisheries meeting that we have been holding annually for more than a decade. We also declined to participate in a ministerial meeting on environmental issues in August hosted by Japan. We have also actively supported the selection of a country other than Japan to host the next intersessional meeting of the IWC. As a result, the IWC voted 17–10 to hold the meeting in Monaco instead of Tokyo.

The United States has intensified its serious engagement on these issues with Japan. In November, we held bilateral consultations with Japan in Tokyo on scientific research on whales. At that meeting, we appreciated receiving the news that Japan is preparing to conduct two nonlethal scientific whale programs in the next 12 months. This is a very encouraging sign. We expect our bilateral meeting will lead to an IWC Scientific Committee workshop on methods for whale research. I view this meeting as a positive but limited step. Our goal remains that Japan substitute nonlethal techniques for its program. We will vigorously pursue this objective in conjunction with our partners in the IWC.

We are concerned that the presence of these additional species of whales in the Japanese market could increase the risk of derivatives of whale products entering international commerce. To this end, we have raised these matters within the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, and an interagency team continues to consider additional measures to enforce international and national prohibitions on trade in whale products. If warranted, the Secretaries of Commerce and the Treasury will take appropriate additional measures.

In sum, I remain deeply concerned by Japan's unilateral actions. For this reason, I have directed the Departments of State, Commerce, the Interior, and the Treasury, as well as the Office of the United States Trade Representative, to keep this matter under active review. I will also direct these agencies to further examine the relationship

between Japanese companies that both manufacture whaling equipment and export products to the U.S. market. I would consider actions regarding any imports from whaling equipment manufacturers, as well as actions regarding a broader range of imported products, should they be warranted by lack of progress from our bilateral and multilateral efforts; however, I do not believe that import prohibitions would further our objectives at this time. We are committed to a sustained effort in order to bring about positive movement in Japan's whaling policies.

Sincerely,

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to J. Dennis Hastert, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

---

## Digest of Other White House Announcements

---

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

---

### **December 23**

In the morning, the President met with participants in the Middle East peace process in the Cabinet Room.

### **December 27**

The President announced the recess appointment of Judith A. Winston as Under Secretary at the Department of Education.

The President announced the recess appointment of Toni G. Fay as a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service.

The President announced the recess appointment of Barbara J. Sapin as Vice Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board.

### **December 28**

The President announced the recess appointment of Allan I. Mendelowitz as Chair and member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Housing Finance Board.

The President declared an emergency in Arkansas and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the areas struck by a severe winter ice storm on December 12 and continuing.

The President declared an emergency in Oklahoma and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the areas struck by a severe winter ice storm on December 25 and continuing.

### **December 29**

The President announced the recess appointment of Timothy Earl Jones as a member of the United States Parole Commission.

The President announced the recess appointment of Marilyn Mason as a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The President announced the recess appointment of Geoff Bacino as a member of the National Credit Union Administration.

The President announced the recess appointments of Nina Archabal, Betty Bengtson, Ron Chew, Bill Duke, Donald Fixico, Henry Glassie, Mary Hubbard, Naomi Shihab Nye, Vicki Ruiz, and Isabel Stewart as members of the National Council on the Humanities.

The President announced the recess appointment of James F. Dobbins as Assistant Secretary of European Affairs at the Department of State.

The President announced the recess appointment of Paulette H. Holahan as a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The President announced the recess appointment of Donald L. Robinson as a member of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

The President announced the recess appointment of Peter F. Romero as Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs.

The President the recess appointment of Islam (Isi) A. Siddiqui as Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs at the Department of Agriculture.

The President the recess appointment of Dennis P. Walsh as a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The President declared a major disaster in North Dakota and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe winter storms and tornadoes on November 1–20.

The President declared a major disaster in Arkansas and ordered Federal aid to supplement state and local recovery efforts in the area struck by a severe winter ice storm beginning on December 12 and continuing.

---

### **Nominations Submitted to the Senate**

---

NOTE: The Congress having adjourned *sine die* on Friday, December 15, 2000, no nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

---

### **Checklist of White House Press Releases**

---

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

#### **Released December 23**

Transcript of a telephone press briefing by Housing and Urban Development Secretary Andrew Cuomo on home loans and public housing\*

Transcript of a press briefing by Assistant Press Secretary for Foreign Affairs P.J. Crowley on the President's morning meeting with participants in the Middle East peace process

#### **Released December 28**

Statement by the Press Secretary on Haitian elections

---

\* This item was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on December 22 but was embargoed for release until 10:06 a.m., December 23.

Statement by Counsel to the President Beth Nolan on the revocation of Executive Order 12834

***Released December 29***

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Jake Siewert

Statement by the Press Secretary on the Clinton's entering into a contract for the purchase of a house in Washington, DC

Announcement: President Clinton Strengthens Federal Government-University Research Partnership

---

**Acts Approved  
by the President**

---

***Approved December 23***

H.R. 1653 / Public Law 106-562

To complete the orderly withdrawal of the NOAA from the civil administration of the Pribilof Islands, Alaska, and to assist in the conservation of coral reefs, and for other purposes

H.R. 2570 / Public Law 106-563  
Lincoln Highway Study Act of 2000

H.R. 3756 / Public Law 106-564  
To establish a standard time zone for Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes

H.R. 4907 / Public Law 106-565  
Jamestown 400th Commemoration Commission Act of 2000

S. 1694 / Public Law 106-566  
To direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the reclamation and reuse of water and wastewater in the State of Hawaii, and for other purposes

***Approved December 27***

H.R. 5630 / Public Law 106-567  
Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001

H.R. 5528 / Public Law 106-568  
Omnibus Indian Advancement Act

H.R. 5640 / Public Law 106-569  
American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000

S. 2943 / Public Law 106-570  
Assistance for International Malaria Control Act

***Approved December 28***

H.R. 207 / Public Law 106-571  
Federal Physicians Comparability Allowance Amendments of 2000

H.R. 2816 / Public Law 106-572  
Computer Crime Enforcement Act

H.R. 3594 / Public Law 106-573  
Installment Tax Correction Act of 2000

H.R. 4020 / Public Law 106-574  
To authorize the addition of land to Sequoia National Park, and for other purposes

H.R. 4656 / Public Law 106-575  
To authorize the Forest Service to convey certain lands in the Lake Tahoe Basin to the Washoe County School District for use as an elementary school site

S. 1761 / Public Law 106-576  
Lower Rio Grande Valley Water Resources Conservation and Improvement Act of 2000

S. 2749 / Public Law 106-577  
To establish the California Trail Interpretive Center in Elko, Nevada, to facilitate the interpretation of the history of development and use of trails in the settling of the western portion of the United States, and for other purposes

S. 2924 / Public Law 106-578  
Internet False Identification Prevention Act of 2000

S. 3181 / Public Law 106-579  
National Moment of Remembrance Act

***Approved December 29***

H.R. 1795 / Public Law 106-580  
National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering Establishment Act